

MAY 24 1922

Volume XXXVII

JUNE, 1922

Number 6

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

SILZ, WALTER.—Rational and Emotional Elements in Heinrich von Kleist,	321
SCHAFER, AARON.—The 'Trente-six ballades joyeuses' of Théodore de Banville,	328
KNOWLTON, E. C.—Causality in 'Samson Agonistes,'	333
VOGT, G. C.—'The Wife of Bath's Tale,' 'Women Pleased,' and 'La Fée Urgele': A Study in the Transformation of Folk-Lore Themes in Drama,	339
BIERSTADT, A. M.—Unacknowledged Poems by Thomas Campbell,	343
TAMBLYN, W. F.—Notes on 'King Lear,'	346
BAUM, P. F.—The Mare and the Wolf,	350
EDDY, W. A.—A Source for Gulliver's First Voyage,	353

Reviews:—

SIR ISRAEL GOLLANCZ, <i>Cleanness</i> , an Alliterative Tripartite Poem on the Deluge, the Destruction of Sodom, and the Death of Belshazzar, by the Poet of <i>Pearl</i> . [R. J. Menner.]	355
E. ERMATINGER, <i>Das dichterische Kunstwerk</i> . [T. M. Campbell.]	362
NEIL C. BROOKS, <i>The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy with Special Reference to the Liturgical Drama</i> . [Grace Frank.]	367
HARRY V. WANN, <i>French Conversation and Composition</i> . [George Getchev.]	370

Correspondence:—

BECK, MARGARET M., <i>The Dance of Death in Shakespeare</i> ,	372
REA, JOHN D., <i>Julius Caesar</i> II, i, 10-34,	374
KLAEBER, FR., "Looking Under the Sun,"	376
TATLOCK, J. S. P., "Under the Sonne,"	377
WITHINGTON, R., <i>A Portmanteau Word of 1761: "Tomax,"</i>	377
SHAFER, R., <i>Henry More's Psychozoia</i> ,	379

Brief Mention:—

OTTO JESPERSEN, <i>Language: its Nature, Development, and Origin</i> ,	379
--	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 2, 1918

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with inter-
mission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to aesthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is
\$5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada \$5.25
and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

A NEW VOLUME BY THE AUTHOR OF "RUDIMENTS
OF CRITICISM"

Expression in Speech and Writing

By E. A. GREENING LAMBORN

These chapters are an account of some experiments in the attempt to develop the powers of self-expression in the children at East Oxford School, and contain the substance of lectures delivered at various times during the past three years to the Oxford Branch of the English Association and to Summer School at Oxford, Cambridge, and Bangor.

Contents: Oral Composition, Written Composition, Verse-making, Original Music, the Rendering of Poetry. Appendix on the Expression of Arithmetical Reasoning.

Copies of the above for examination with a view to class use may be had on request



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

American Branch

35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK



MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXVII

JUNE, 1922

NUMBER 6

RATIONAL AND EMOTIONAL ELEMENTS IN HEINRICH VON KLEIST

It is by no means uncommon that a German poet should have, early in life, a philosophical experience of profound and decisive effect. In his twenty-fourth year Heinrich von Kleist was convinced by the study of the Kantian philosophy that final knowledge is impossible of attainment, that we can hope to know at most only the appearance of things; and thereupon he cast to the winds the rationalistic philosophy which he had so confidently elaborated. Deprived of Reason as the guide of life, he was without a guide; incomprehensible life was to him tragic; and the tragedy of it he proceeded to illustrate in dramatic form.

This philosophical catastrophe was not merely an effect; it was also a symptom. Evidently it need not have affected so profoundly or so tragically a poet who was not to a dangerous extent a reasoner, a ponderer on that essence of life which lies back of its phenomena.

Otto Ludwig and Friedrich Hebbel were also, though from different points of view, excessive reasoners. Ludwig's poetic imagination suffered from the interference of his critical reason, and Hebbel was acquainted with that excessive clearness of vision which impedes, instead of aiding, the poetic process:

Dies steht so klar vor meinem Geist,
Dass, wenn ich's minder hell erblickte,
Das Werk vielleicht mir besser glückte.

(Der Diamant, Prolog)

It was only natural, then, that Hebbel should have discerned and criticized in Kleist a fault he knew to be in himself; he observes

in his *Diary*: "In Heinrich von Kleists falscher Plastik wird gewissermassen der Lebensodem auch sichtbar gemacht."¹

Perhaps this antagonism of reason and imagination, and the consciousness of it, are impediments of modern poets in general. At any rate, they are especially characteristic of Kleist. To a poet of less rationalistic temper, the recognition of the relativity of all knowledge and the limitation of human cognition to phenomena, might have proved not only innocuous, but positively invigorating. Such a poet might have derived enhanced self-confidence from the thought that Nature is for us what we see and hear and feel; that this most beautiful world is not, in the Fichtean phraseology, until the poet perceives it through his finer senses. Such a view of poetry is epitomized in Goethe's *Türmerlied*:

Zum Sehen geboren,
Zum Schauen bestellt,
Dem Turme geschworen,
Gefällt mir die Welt.

Ihr glücklichen Augen,
Was je ihr gesehn,
Es sei, wie es wolle,
Es war doch so schön!

But this attitude was not possible for a man who all his life saw too clearly and felt himself impelled to portray too truthfully what he saw with an eye not merely sensuous. Kleist was by nature rigorously honest. He found it always difficult and often impossible to separate himself from his work, and rise superior to it. His dramas are such agonizing births because they treat not simply an objective and a formal, but also a subjective and a personal problem. And in the most personal of them the white heat of passion burns away the poetic form: *Guiskard* remained a torso, *Penthesilea* a madness. Kleist's works are autobiographical in a more poignant sense than Goethe's. Rare indeed were the moments when Kleist could write of himself, as he did from Switzerland in 1802: "Ich . . . kann zuweilen wie ein Dritter über mich urteilen."²

¹ *Werke*, ed. Werner, iv, 5740.

² *Werke*, ed. Erich Schmidt, v, 282, 18-19.

The man and the poet are in Kleist inseparable. That is why he so promptly assumed an attitude of personal hostility toward Goethe and Iffland. He so identified life and poetry that disparagement of his work was, in his eyes, tantamount to contempt for his personality. In the fictitious *Brief eines jungen Dichters an einen jungen Maler*, Kleist voices his opinion as to the element of personality in art: "Die Aufgabe, Himmel und Erde! ist ja nicht, ein anderer, sondern ihr selbst zu sein, und euch selbst, euer Eigenstes und Innerstes, durch Umriss und Farben, zur Anschauung zu bringen."³

In the version of *Käthchen* printed in the *Phöbus* in 1808, Kunigunde is made to say, of a lesser art, to be sure, but still characteristically:

Die Kunst . . .
Ist mehr, als blos ein sinnereizendes
Verbinden von Gestalten und von Farben.
Das unsichtbare Ding, das Seele heisst,
Möcht' ich an Allem gern erscheinen machen.⁴

And in the last year of his life, Kleist wrote to Fouqué: "Die Erscheinung, die am meisten bei der Betrachtung eines Kunstwerks rührt, ist, dünkt mich, nicht das Werk selbst, sondern die Eigentümlichkeit des Geistes, der es hervorbrachte, und der sich, in unbewusster Freiheit und Lieblichkeit, darin entfaltet."⁵ Here is one of those passages which give rise to facile and specious comparisons of Kleist with the Romanticists. Yet his ultimate motive, here as elsewhere, is essentially un-Romantic: a passionate desire for the ascertainment of recondite truth. And no devotee of the Romantic Irony, certainly, would have contented himself with merely "unconscious" freedom to dominate his work.

Kleist himself recognized the distance between the domains of reason and of imagination when he wrote: "Ich kann eine Differentiale finden, und einen Vers machen; sind das nicht die beiden Enden der menschlichen Fähigkeit?"⁶ In one of his last letters, he deplores his inability to visualize adequately an absent friend; his reason tells him that the friend exists, and this importunate sense of reality fetters his imagination: "Wirklich, in

³ *Ibid.*, iv, 146, 27-30.

⁴ *Ibid.*, iv, 365.

⁵ *Ibid.*, v, 418, 14-18.

⁶ *Ibid.*, v, 316, 23-25.

einem so besonderen Falle ist noch vielleicht kein Dichter gewesen. . . . Es ist, als ob diese, in allen Bedingungen angeordnete Bestimmtheit, meiner Phantasie, im Augenblick der Tätigkeit selbst, Fesseln anlegte."⁷

The same rationalistic quality in his nature which had made him a too easy victim to philosophy, the same unhappy sense for a truth not merely poetic, but real, thus played havoc with the impulsive ventures of his imagination. It rendered him unable to stop at superficial beauties; it bade him probe with relentless reason into the very heart of the mystery of things. In a letter to his sister, he laments over the "unhappy clarity" of vision which nature has inflicted upon him:

Vielleicht hat die Natur Dir jene Klarheit zu Deinem Glücke versagt, jene traurige Klarheit, die mir zu jeder Miene den Gedanken, zu jedem Worte den Sinn, zu jeder Handlung den Grund nennt. Sie zeigt mir alles, was mich umgiebt, und mich selbst, in seiner ganzen armseligen Blöße, und der farbige Nebel verschwindet, und alle die gefällig geworfenen Schleier sinken und dem Herzen ekelt zuletzt vor dieser Nacktheit. O glücklich bist Du, wenn Du das nicht verstehst.⁸

Fully aware of the fatal dualism in his own nature, Kleist looked with wistful longing upon those naive artists who portray external beauty, troubled by no doubt as to the truth behind it: "O wie oft habe ich diese glücklichen Menschen beneidet, welche kein Zweifel um das Wahre, das sich nirgends findet, bekümmert, die nur in dem Schönen leben."⁹ It was Kleist's tragedy as a poet that he was not, and knew that he was not, such a naive artist, that he could not, like Keats, believe in the identity of Truth and Beauty, but was cursed with the desire to seek beyond Beauty for an absolute Truth.

Realizing the obstructive effect of this rationalistic element in his character, he tried to counteract it. He emphasizes repeatedly the importance of immediacy of feeling in poetry. To his friend Rühle he writes: "Ich höre, Du, mein lieber Junge, beschäftigst Dich auch mit der Kunst? Es giebt nichts Göttlicheres, als sie! Und nichts Leichtereres zugleich; und doch, warum ist es so schwer? Jede erste Bewegung, alles Unwillkürliche, ist schön; und schief und verschroben Alles, sobald es sich selbst begreift. O der Ver-

⁷ *Ibid.*, v, 427, 27-34.

⁸ *Ibid.*, v, 222, 17-20.

⁹ *Ibid.*, v, 189, 24-32.

stand! Der unglückselige Verstand! Studiere nicht zu viel, mein lieber Junge . . . Folge Deinem Gefühl."¹⁰ And to the same purport he writes to the painter Lohse: "Nichts, nichts gedacht, frage Dein erstes Gefühl, dem folge."¹¹

Shortly before his death Kleist looked forward to a period of high literary productivity, in which his works should reflect his inner self directly, without the intervention of critical reason:

Alsdann will ich meinem Herzen ganz und gar, wo es mich hinführt, folgen, und schlechterdings auf nichts Rücksicht nehmen, als auf meine eigene innerliche Befriedigung. . . . Kurz, ich will mich von dem Gedanken ganz durchdringen, dass, wenn ein Werk nur recht frei aus dem Schooss des menschlichen Gemüts hervorgeht, dasselbe auch notwendig darum der ganzen Menschheit angehören müsse.¹²

The same striving for an immediacy of expression which shall eliminate the intrusive rational processes is evident in Kleist's utterances concerning the language of poetry. He makes one poet say to another: "Wenn ich beim Dichten in meinen Busen fassen, meinen Gedanken ergreifen, und mit Händen, ohne weitere Zutat, in den Deinigen legen könnte, so wäre, die Wahrheit zu gestehen, die ganze innere Forderung meiner Seele erfüllt."¹³ He deplores the inadequacy of language to convey ideas and feelings: "Selbst das einzige [Mittel zur Mitteilung], das wir besitzen, die Sprache, taugt nicht dazu; sie kann die Seele nicht malen, und was sie uns giebt, sind nur zerrissene Bruchstücke."¹⁴ Usually, language is a "fetter," a "brake on the wheel of the spirit."¹⁵

And I believe it was the same search for a non-rational and immediate mode of communication which led Kleist again and again to music. The inclination toward music is one of very few tendencies which connect Kleist with Romanticism. It was the yearning of the Romanticists for unity of consciousness, for the reunion of sense and soul, of nature and the individual, which made them turn to music as to the realm which Wackenroder called "das Land des Glaubens, wo alle unsre Zweifel und unsre Leiden sich in ein tönendes Meer verlieren." But for Kleist, again, it was not only an artistic or a metaphysical, but an acutely personal concern. And Kleist could never have lost himself in that

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, v, 328, 4-11.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, v, 273, 26-7.

¹² *Ibid.*, v, 430, 9-20.

¹³ *Ibid.*, iv, 148, 26-29.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, v, 195, 2-4.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, iv, 78, 22-3.

vague and subjective emotionalism which the younger Tieck sought in music.

We are told that, though he had no formal musical schooling, Kleist early showed an aptitude for music, and could repeat readily melodies learned by ear. As a young lieutenant of the guard at Potsdam, he played the clarinet in an orchestra of officers, and he is even credited with a few simple compositions. There is in his early letters a passage which reminds one remotely of Otto Ludwig's confession regarding his process of poetic composition. Kleist speaks of being able to hear, especially in the solitude of evening, concerts complete in every detail of melody and orchestration. These concerts he can repeat to himself at will; but as soon as a *thought* intrudes, the whole celestial symphony vanishes as if at the touch of magic.¹⁶ Again, speaking of the influence of landscape on the development of character, he puts music at the head of the arts which appeal to feeling.¹⁷

Apparently, then, Kleist regarded music as predominantly an emotional art, and this is corroborated by his allusion to its distinctly feminine nature;¹⁸ the feminine is for Kleist always the irrational and emotional. In the days which followed the terrific disillusionment by Kant, when his attitude toward Catholicism changed significantly from the coldly rationalistic to the intuitively emotional, he is tremendously impressed by the power of church music.¹⁹

His theoretical interest in music seems to have increased toward the end of his life. A notable document for this is the story *Die heilige Cäcilie oder die Gewalt der Musik*,²⁰ in which a miraculous power is attributed to the art of Saint Cecilia. And some of the thoughts of Nietzsche's *Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik* are foreshadowed in a remarkable utterance in one of Kleist's last letters: the poet speaks of his intention to forsake poetry entirely for a year or more, and devote himself almost exclusively to music, which he appears to regard as a transcendental, parent art of arts:

Denn ich betrachte diese Kunst als die Wurzel, oder vielmehr, um mich schulgerecht auszudrücken, als die algebraische Formel aller übrigen, und

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, v, 133, 26-134, 10.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 100, 21-24.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, III, 378, 25-6.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, v, 222, 25 ff.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, III, 377-390.

so wie wir schon einen Dichter haben [Goethe]—mit dem ich mich übrigens auf keine Weise zu vergleichen wage—der alle seine Gedanken über die Kunst, die er übt, auf Farben bezogen hat, so habe ich, von meiner frühesten Jugend an, alles Allgemeine, was ich über die Dichtkunst gedacht habe, auf Töne bezogen. Ich glaube, dass im Generalbass die wichtigsten Aufschlüsse über die Dichtkunst enthalten sind.²¹

To be sure, the last sentence, with its allusion to the "grammar" of music, presents a rationalistic idea. But that should not surprise us in a poet in whom reason and feeling appear at times to interpenetrate; Kleist's reason seems impelled by the passionate vindictiveness of feeling, and his feeling by the remorseless logic of thought. Two sentences of Otto Ludwig succinctly characterize this strange union: "Bei Kleist zeigt sich uns der Verstand als Leidenschaft,"²² and again: "Die Leidenschaft handelt nicht allein, sie reflektiert auch."²³ It is no mere chance that Kleist should speak, in one of his most characteristic figures, of the "Goldwage der Empfindung."²⁴ But such a union of the two elements was as spurious and as deceptive as the premature serenity of Kleist's youthful rationalism. Reason and feeling remained antagonistic, and Kleist suffered as a creative artist from this unresolved antinomy in his nature.²⁵

WALTER SILZ.

Harvard University.

²¹ *Ibid.*, v, 429, 24-33.

²² *Gesammelte Werke*, Leipzig, 1891, v, 349.

²³ *Ibid.*, 532.

²⁴ *Werke*, I, 264, 1396; III, 147, 26.

²⁵ Some readers of *Modern Language Notes* may not yet know of the existence of the *Kleist-Gesellschaft*, which was founded in Berlin in 1920 and has its seat in Frankfurt a. O. The first general meeting was held in the latter city last winter under the presidency of Professor Minde-Pouet. The society aims to foster the memory of Kleist and the literature concerning him, and to publish "Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft" and a year-book. Its organization is democratic, and its membership in Germany is already large. One may become a member by applying to the Schriftführer. Geschäftsstelle der Kleist-Gesellschaft, Frankfurt a. O., Gubener Strasse 36. The annual dues are at least 20 Marks, and life membership may be acquired by the contribution of at least 1000 Marks.

THE TRENTE-SIX BALLADES JOYEUSES OF
THEODORE DE BANVILLE

In his dissertation on the life and work of Théodore de Banville,¹ Fuchs notes Banville's admission that he had modeled his *Trente-six ballades joyeuses*² after Villon. He then proceeds to call attention to some of the more obvious imitations; but the scope of his work prevents his studying this point in detail. The attempt will be made here to show just how close was Banville's dependence upon Villon, upon the ballads as well as upon the rest of the *Grand testament* and upon the *Petit testament*.

The *Trente-six ballades joyeuses* may be roughly divided, from the point of view of subject matter, into the following groups: 1) those that treat of women and of love (16); 2) those which sing of one or another phase of the joy of living (5); 3) those whose refrain is the love of poetry (3); 4) those which celebrate one or another aspect of nature (5); 5) those whose central theme is the poet himself (4); and 6) those written in a tone of counsel or of irony (3). Of these rubrics, all are present in Villon with the exception of the love of poetry and the love of nature. Villon, the poet of death, as M. Lanson calls him,³ and only secondarily that of the joys of life, was too spontaneous a poet to be concerned with the art of versification as such, and he was still too much of the Middle Ages to be susceptible to the external graces of nature. Banville might, thus, be called a blasé, though nature-loving, Villon. The thirty-six ballads show both of these elements lacking in the *Grand testament* and the *Petit testament*.

The first of the *Trente-six ballades joyeuses*, the "Ballade de ses regrets pour l'an mil huit cent trente," written in January, 1862, reflects Banville's feeling that French literature, which had attained to such heights in 1830, was now on the wane. Just as Villon laments the disappearance of the "snows of yesteryear," and his "belle heaulmière" gives voice to her regrets for the evanescence

¹ *Théodore de Banville—contributions à l'histoire de la poésie française pendant la seconde moitié du xix siècle*, p. 399.

² Paris, Lemerre, 1873. Ten of these thirty-six ballads had previously appeared in the *Parnasse contemporain* for 1869. The edition used in this study is that published by Fasquelle, Paris, 1907.

³ *Histoire de la littérature française*, 13th edition, p. 176.

of the charms of her youth, mourning that nothing is left her but "honte et peché," so Banville sighs for the day when "Musset chantait, Hugo tenait la lyre," when Nodier, the two Deschamps, and Vigny gave such impetus to the Romantic movement; but his sighs are in vain, for "à présent, c'est bien fini de rire." The mood of the very next ballad, however, the "Ballade des belles Châlonnaises," is much more sprightly, though with a gaiety which Fuchs rightly deems artificial. Villon had found that the women of Paris are paramount in gossip; Banville, making himself the judge of other feminine virtues, awarded the palm for physical perfection to the women of Châlons, a city whose name he probably chose because of its usefulness as the rhyming word in the refrain. In its detailed description of the charms of the "filles de Châlons," this ballad recalls the "Regrets de la belle heaulmière" as well as the "Ballade de la belle heaulmière."

Banville's "Ballade de la bonne doctrine" (No. 3), again, is only a nineteenth-century version of Villon's "Ballade de bonne doctrine à ceux de mauvaise vie," with the Rabelaisian touch which Fuchs justly calls one of the dominant elements of the *Trente-six ballades joyeuses*. But the true Banvillesque note is sounded in the "Envoi," in which the poet expresses himself as being "épris," not "d'amour," but "des vers, des lys, des falbalas, Tranchons le mot, de la littérature." In a word, Banville's epicureanism seems to be chiefly of the imagination, and it is in his cultivation of literature as the supreme pleasure of life, in his love of art for its own sake, that Banville differs from both his great models, Villon and Rabelais. The "Ballade de sa fidélité à la poésie" (no. 6) succinctly expresses this side of Banville's nature; in the refrain the poet asks and answers the question as to his purpose in life: "Pourquoi je vis? Pour l'amour du laurier." This refrain may be contrasted with that of the "Ballade intitulée: Les Contredits de Franc-Gontier" which Villon bequeathed to his friend "maistre Andry Courault." Villon's maxim: "Il n'est trésor que de vivre à son aise" has a much more genuine ring than do those of Banville's ballads in which the joys of life are extolled. Banville was never more than a sort of epicurean dilettante; Villon was a thorough-going epicurean who was subject to spells of remorse and whose baser moments were more than redeemed by his inspired glimpses behind the veil of the eternal which shrouds appearances.

The "Ballade en l'honneur de sa mie" (no. 4) brings out rather forcefully the more or less superficial manner in which Banville has imitated Villon. The "Ballade de Villon à s'amyé" is permeated by a strain of sadness, by the rational element that is so marked in all the work of this "first of the moderns." If Villon writes a ballad in honor of his lady-love, it is to complain of "amour dure, plus que fer, à mascher," to foresee the early disappearance of the charms of youth, the day when "vieil je seray, vous, laide et sans couleur," and to call upon every generous-minded person to come to his rescue. Banville, in lighter vein, scorns the wealth of a Rothschild, the pedantry of a Nisard declaring: "Je ne veux du tout que ma mie." Likewise, in his "Ballade pour une amoureuse" (no. 5), Banville, light of heart, sees everything through the most rose-tinted of spectacles. It suffices merely to place this ballad beside the touching tribute paid by Villon in his *Petit testament* to her who "si durement m'a chassé."⁴

The nature-ballads of Banville (nos. 7, 16, 17, 28, and 32) resemble Villon's poems in form only; their content bespeaks rather the influence of the Pléiade. On the other hand, the ultra-romanticism of the ballads in which Banville writes about himself (nos. 18, 26, and 36) is well matched by the fifteenth-century individualism of Villon, by that keen delight in self⁵ with which the Renaissance inspired a world so long shackled by the dry, utterly impersonal, scholasticism of the Dark Ages.

As for the remainder of the Banville ballads which are concerned with love and with the women of the poet's entourage, the "Ballade sur la gentille façon de Rose" (no. 8) would seem to be but the Banvillesque version of Villon's stanzas to his own "chère Rose;"⁶ the "Ballade pour sa commère" (no. 9), with its display

⁴Stanzas 5-10, *Oeuvres*, ed. Lacroix, Paris, E. Flammarion.

⁵Gaston Paris, in his monograph on Villon, considers this personal note the dominating characteristic of our poet; "C'est par là," says Paris (p. 153), "que son œuvre est surtout originale et qu'il mérite le nom du premier des poètes modernes." Cf. Villon's "Ballade au nom de la fortune," the "Ballade de Villon," the "Débat du cuer et du corps de Villon," the "Quatrain que fait Villon quand il fut jugé à mourir," and stanza 14, among many others of the *Grand testament*, in which Villon so frankly admits his sinfulness: "Je suis pecheur, je le scay bien."

⁶*Grand testament*, stanzas 80-83

of feminine graces, recalls, again, the "belle heaulmière" poems. The bitterness, real or pretended, of Banville's "Ballade pour célébrer les pucelles" (no. 10) brings to mind many of the stanzas of the *Grand testament*, more especially, perhaps, those celebrated ones inspired by the "charnier des Innocens."⁷ The "Ballade pour la servante du cabaret" (no. 13), is the counterpart of the "Ballade de Villon et de la grosse Margot." In the "Ballade pour trois soeurs qui sont ses amies" (no. 15), Lucy, Lise, and Marinette appear to be no more than softened images of Marianne l'Ydolle, "la grant Jehanne de Bretagne," and their ilk;⁸ or, too, of the "filles tresbelles et gentes" who are celebrated in stanza 94 of the *Grand testament*. The "Ballade pour les Parisiennes" (no. 21) is, again, Banville's tribute to the "Ballade des femmes de Paris." The "Ballade à sa femme, Lorraine" (no. 24) may be placed alongside the "Ballade que Villon donna à ung gentilhomme nouvellement marié, pour l'envoyer à son espouse, par luy conquise à l'espée." The "Ballade de l'amour bon ouvrier" (no. 27) is the antithesis of many of Villon's expressions on the same subject, set forth, for example, in the "Double ballade sur le mesme propos," and in stanza 25 of the *Grand testament*, beginning: "Il est bien vray que j'ay aymé." The "Ballade à sa mère" (no. 31) recalls Villon's reference to his mother in the *Grand testament*.⁹ And after celebrating his mother in a ballad, it was most natural that Banville should address the Virgin, the patroness of the mothers of both great poets. Thus the "Ballade que feit Villon à la requeste de sa mère pour prier Nostre Dame" is paralleled by Banville's "Ballade à la sainte vierge" (no. 35). There remain but three ballads in the group that is concerned with women and love for which no precise parallels are to be found in Villon; the "Ballade pour une aux cheveux dorés" (no. 14), the "Ballade pour une guerrière de marbre" (no. 19),¹⁰ and the "Ballade de la belle Viroise" (no. 25); but these ballads contain only repetitions of notions expressed in many others of the group so that echoes and resemblances suggest themselves in Villon.

⁷ Stanzas 147-152.

⁸ Cf. *Grand testament*, stanza 141.

⁹ Stanza 79.

¹⁰ The subject here, to be sure, is the statue of a woman, but the poem may be said to fall into the present rubric.

In ballads 29 and 30 of Banville's collection, the "Ballade de Victor Hugo père de tous les rimeurs" and the "Ballade de la sainte buverie," no direct comparisons with anything in Villon offer themselves; whereas in the "Ballade en faveur de la poésie dédaignée" (no. 11), the refrain: "Où dors-tu, grande ombre d'Alcée?" reminds one faintly of the refrain in the "Ballade des dames du temps jadis."

Those of Banville's ballads which treat of the joy of living or which are written in a tone of somewhat ironical counsel show the same difference of attitude in the nineteenth century poet and the fifteenth century poet as do those in which Banville treats of the pleasures of love. The "Ballade de Banville aux enfants perdus" (no. 12) is something more than a mere echo of the "Belle leçon de Villon aux enfants perdus;" for whereas Villon is thinking of the material things of life exclusively and advises his friends to spend what money they have, for "jamais mal acquest ne proufite," Banville's thoughts fly to distant ages and distant climes. "Volons, charmés, vers les Dieux primitifs!" this is his invitation; and his burden; "Embarquons-nous pour la belle Cythère." The "Ballade sur les chanteurs" (no. 33) and that which follows it, the "Ballade de la joyeuse chanson du cor" do not point to any specific lines or poems in Villon, but their note of gay freedom (Banville calls his hunters "francs bohémiens") may be contrasted with the celebrated stanza in the *Grand testament* in which Villon, in a tone of somewhat roguish remorse, regrets his wild youth.¹¹

There remain three of the "trente-six ballades" which have not yet been mentioned, and which may be placed in one rubric because they are written in a tone of either counsel or irony. The "Ballade de la bonne doctrine" (no. 3) has already been contrasted with Villon's ballad of the same name. The "Double ballade pour les bonnes gens" (no. 20), with its bitter attack upon the wealthy and its prayer that "Dieu fasse aux bons miséricorde" would seem to be somewhat distantly related to Villon's "Ballade des povres housseurs."¹² The "Double ballade des sottises de Paris" (no. 22) might be placed beside the "Ballade des femmes de Paris;"

¹¹ Stanzas 22-26.

¹² Poésies diverses, *Oeuvres*, p. 146.

finally, the "Ballade à Georges Rochegrosse" (no. 23), with its admonitory refrain: "Souviens-toi bien de cela, Georges," calls to mind the "Problème ou ballade au nom de la fortune," where the refrain runs: "Par mon conseil, prends tout en gré, Villon."

With Villon always as his model for form and Rabelais frequently his model for treatment,¹³ Banville has added his own distinctly original note in the composition of his *Trente-six ballades joyeuses*, thereby fulfilling his promise to "faire renaître la ballade ancienne dans une fille vivante et créer la ballade nouvelle."¹⁴ We have, in short, a composite very similar to that revealed in Banville's theatrical masterpiece, *Gringoire*, a work that was practically contemporaneous with the *Trente-six ballades joyeuses*.¹⁵

AARON SCHAFFER.

The University of Texas.

CAUSALITY IN *SAMSON AGONISTES*

Samson Agonistes like *Paradise Lost* has given rise to fresh discussion. P. F. Baum¹ has presented a theory opposed to that of J. W. Tupper.² His procedure has been unusual in that he fails to name his modern opponent, who is a well-known authority on English drama, and for some reason he deems it wise to concentrate his disapproval on Samuel Johnson. Of late years, critics have been readjusting their views of the Great Cham, and finding after

¹³In the "Ballade de la sainte buverie," Banville refers to "maître François," and the refrain reads: "C'est Rabelais qui nous verse du vin."

¹⁴Cf. Avant-propos to the *Trente-six ballades nouvelles*.

¹⁵For a brief discussion of the Villon-Gringore-Banville composite in the characterization of the hero of this play, cf. the introduction to the present writer's edition of *Gringoire*, New York, 1921, p. xxi. Some mention is also made there of Banville's indebtedness to Villon's "Épitaphe en forme de ballade" in the composition of his "Ballade des pendus." Other ballads by Banville, outside of the "Trente-six," that show the obvious influence of Villon are the "Ballade de la vraie sagesse," the "Ballade aux célébrités du temps jadis" and the one whose refrain runs "Aux pauvres gens tout est peine et misère."

¹*PMLA.*, xxxv, 375-389.

²*PMLA.*, xxxvi, 354-371.

all that many of his opinions are practical and sensible. We must weigh carefully most of Johnson's dicta still, though we need not believe him infallible. We cannot reject a judgment merely because Johnson pronounced it. Especially ought we to act with caution when we consider his criticisms of drama. Though he does not appear to have had a most liberal attitude toward imaginative possibilities in plays, he did have an acquaintance with both classical and English drama that many a modern specialist might envy. He attempted unsuccessfully a classical play, *Irene*. He edited Shakspeare. He was intimately acquainted with Goldsmith and other playwrights of his time, and he was a conspicuous attendant at Garrick's theatre. His equipment was therefore ample. His intellectual acumen is unmistakeable. To-day we cannot afford cursorily to dismiss his judgment on so important and plain a matter as the question whether a play has a middle. Yet Dr. Baum has snubbed Johnson.

Johnson declared that *Samson Agonistes* lacks a middle. Aristotle and others have insisted that a play should have a middle. Professor Tupper has supported Johnson in finding that Milton's tragedy has no middle. Dr. Baum, however, declares that such is not its defect. Both he and Dr. Tupper feel great admiration for the work as literature. The present paper does not aim to point out the numerous astounding merits of the play, such as the emotional effect of the choruses, but to examine the views of the recent critics.

Dr. Baum asserts that *Samson Agonistes* is weak because it is "tame," because it lacks conflict: "the essence of tragic action is conflict." This is the Hegelian contention, the difficulty with which is that conflict is not the essence. In fact it depends for its value structurally and "spiritually" upon the principle of causality; it is a mode or aspect of causality. Though we may admit to tragedy a small element of chance, we must emphasize causal relations, whether we see them in human character, in human acts, or in interference by a superhuman power.³ Causal

³ Just as literature in the last hundred years has reacted toward scientific progress and philosophy, so the Greek drama of the fifth century B. C. reacted toward the advance in philosophy up to Socrates and Plato. The pre-Socratics engaged diligently in the study of causation, and advanced various theories as to the initial cause. They agreed that life bears an

motivation is familiar to students of the structure of plays and of short stories; Thomas Hardy, it will be remembered, has expressed a wish to see it applied more frequently and more strictly to novels. The steps of causation may be in immediate causal sequence, or may act independently but directly upon the catastrophe for a co-operative effect. The following diagram will make clear divergent methods of handling causation in plots. A combination of both is often employed.

- a) 1 > 2 > 3 > 4 > 5 (which may be catastrophe)
 1 >
 2 >
 b) 3 > 5 (which may be catastrophe)
 4 >

In *Samson Agonistes* Milton either followed causality or did not. To be dramatic as distinguished from spectacular or imaginative or inspiring, he as author would have to employ causal relations and to make them clear. That he did not do so, in either action or character, save briefly in the first episode that handles Manoa, is the view of Dr. Tupper. The plot, he believes, is stationary, and so essentially is the mood. The issue of causality Dr. Baum does not appreciate and face. He eludes it by speaking of a lack of improbability, by enforcing absence of conflict, by comparing the work with classical dramas, by declaring Milton's material intractable.

As to probability, the first item, Dr. Baum does not realize that it must be positive, not negative; the sequence, to be sure, is not always necessary, that is, fixed; two or more solutions may be possible from some premises. They must be such as we can deem possible and probable. Thus the solution of Manoa seems possible and probable up to Samson's decision; but the solution offered by Dalila is improbable, all the more because the solution of Manoa has been lost, and also in consequence of the fact that Samson has plainly been for a long time quite adverse to her. Not for the world would I lose the portrayal of Dalila, which is scarcely matched in literature. It is tremendously effective, but it is not

aspect which they called causation. (To what degree they were right has been debated by philosophers ever since.) Similarly the Greek tragic poets found the principle of causation essential to their dramas.

dramatic in this play. It would go well for an imaginary conversation or for a dramatic lyric, but it is not introduced to cause the catastrophe, through either deed or character, though it might have been made to do so. Likewise, the episode with Harapha does not contribute to the probability or the inevitability of the catastrophe. The giant is distinctly less interesting than Dalila; the employment of him brings about an anticlimax. He is cowardly, and therefore is unworthy of Samson; he is not valuable for emphasis near the end of the drama, because physical strength is not impressive or intellectual as Milton treats it here, is not so subtle or so spiritual as the episodes with Dalila and Manoa. Yet the Harapha episode might have been used to forward the action and effect the catastrophe.

Dr. Baum's second defense against the "Johnsonian shifts" is that the play lacks conflict. Conflict, as I have indicated, rests on the basis of causality. It is an admirable method of developing in an interesting fashion a series of dramatic scenes. But it is not so fundamental as causality.

His third apology for Milton relies on adducing instances from the Greek masters, whom he assumes without warrant Dr. Tupper has not read. He devotes considerable space to refreshing our acquaintance with the structural similarity between *Samson Agonistes* and the *Prometheus Bound* of Aeschylus. This is an unfortunate example for several reasons. In the first place, we cannot defend a modern drama which is complete in itself by comparing it with a drama which is an organic part of a trilogy. Aspects of the *Prometheus* might be quite different if we were able to know fully the details of the trilogy. Such is the situation for any critic today, whether or not Milton thought of the fact. In addition, the Greek drama is more organic than Dr. Baum indicates. The play seeks to establish as strongly as possible Prometheus' side in his controversy with Zeus. As it opens, it reveals the hero in woe. Kratos, who directs his enchainment, shows that Zeus is physically powerful; Hephaestus reinforces our idea of Zeus's might, because he does his work in spite of sympathy for Prometheus. The chorus, composed of the daughters of Oceanus, who is related to Prometheus by marriage, would comfort the afflicted rebel, but he is determined in his righteousness, and will admit no error (herein behaving unlike Samson). Oceanus then comes to

offer his relative practical aid. He finds, however, that he cannot do so, because the hero proves that Zeus will not relent. Thus the solution he suggests is not possible; it even might involve Oceanus also in trouble. By this episode, therefore, the final disaster is made more ominous, fearful, and certain. Next Io enters to reveal Zeus's injustice when the supreme deity does not hate, but favors. Her episode magnifies the danger of Prometheus' position, making it more awe-inspiring. In her, nevertheless, the hero sees hope, namely, the source of the agency that will bring about his release. (In this way the release in another play of the trilogy is in part motivated.) Moreover, Prometheus' prediction to Io of a marriage which will injure Zeus causes Hermes to come as a messenger from the despotic god, and finally Prometheus' refusal to answer Hermes' question about the marriage brings on with the close of the play a catastrophe of increased torture for the hero. By the episodes of Oceanus and Io the catastrophe of the play has been made more inevitable, more terrible, and because of them the audience will look forward to the next play in the trilogy. The principle of causality is far more apparent in *Prometheus Bound* than in *Samson Agonistes*.

The Libation-Bearers yields satisfactorily to an examination for causal relationship, and is moreover an organic part of a trilogy. *The Suppliants* is plainly motivated. Dr. Baum's other examples from the three tragic Greek masters may be similarly analyzed.

Yet we need not hesitate to admit that some Greek tragedies were weak in causation; but though they were weak dramatically, they were not of necessity weak as spectacles. *Samson Agonistes* is weak in the Harapha incident, which is a poor scene to witness. *The Persians* is not thus affected. Moreover, its theme has a broad basis, and appeals to many universal feelings. We can imagine plots different from that used, which should portray the prodigious reversal and downfall of a man seemingly secure of fortune. Aeschylus, however, chose a plot which in scene would contrast sharply with the spectators who would attend the production of his play at Athens and with the setting which nature afforded as background to the theatre. An audience composed of citizens who were not under the power of an insolent monarch looked in imagination at the sorrows which a society experienced in a distant realm. They had an intimate vision of the life at a court which

held its position to be supreme on earth. The Athenians witnessed not merely the fall of a man from fortune but the defeat of an empire. They saw the suffering of their enemies at a remote Persian palace, while from where they sat they could gaze off at will over land which led to the sea-shore. Just beyond neighboring hills on the horizon lay, as they knew, the gulf and the island of Salamis, and the site of their tremendous victory over the Persian multitudes, the site of the triumph of free citizens over an imperial navy. The contrasts were brilliantly effected. In themselves they suffice as a defense for the existence of the play. But they do not make the play dramatic in the true sense. The problem of motivation is different, and though it would be possible to defend the play on such ground, I do not need to go into the problem now. But *Samson Agonistes* does not consistently produce non-dramatic results so emotionally effective as those of *The Persians*.

Lastly, Dr. Baum defends *Samson Agonistes* by declaring that the material is obstinate, that it will not allow of dramatic treatment. This contention cannot be admitted. There are a number of possibilities whereby the play can be made causal and dramatic. One of these may appear a trifle obvious upon examination. Its effectiveness as poetry would depend upon Milton. I shall not change Milton's order of episodes, because I can secure causal motivation without further changes, and a climactic arrangement is another problem altogether, though easy of solution. The plot can be handled thus:

Have the Manoa episode bring about the catastrophe more clearly than it does now. Alter the episode of Dalila so that she goes indignantly to the Philistines in order to report Samson's attitude. Similarly make the Harapha episode causal. Then if desirable for absolute clarity, alter the messenger's report of the catastrophe. Suppose that a Philistine council is in session. Let Manoa appear before it, trying to get Samson released by ransom. While the council is inclining favorably to his plea, let Dalila come with her complaints and render the issue doubtful. Have the balance still sway indecisively up to the entrance of Harapha with additional reports of Samson's insolence. Let his news rouse the council to a denial of Manoa's plea (Manoa having left the presence in the meantime, however), and to a decision to humiliate Samson further.

Thus the catastrophe is motivated from beginning to end, and the material is not found intractable.

Examination of Dr. Baum's views, therefore, shows that several of them are untenable. For a play to have a middle, it must have causal motivation, such as *Samson Agonistes* lacks to a large degree. The want cannot be defended by an asseveration that something else is missing, to wit, conflict. Nor should ancient plays, especially if they are imperfect by the standards of Aristotle, be advanced to excuse defects in Milton, who was not forced by circumstances to write a play at all hazards, and who was familiar enough with Shakspeare, Jonson, and other Elizabethan dramatists to realize that they employed causality, even if he himself did not discover any necessity to do so in his own case. Moreover, the ancient examples that Dr. Baum has most emphasized he has not carefully studied as parts of trilogies or as units. Finally, we cannot allow the defense that Milton's material was intractable.

Dr. Baum has made interesting and sound observations as to the play, but he has not succeeded in ousting Dr. Tupper from his central position wherein he contends that the play lacks a middle, and that this defect is in marked degree the cause of our dissatisfaction with it as a drama.

E. C. KNOWLTON.

Ohio Wesleyan University.

THE WIFE OF BATH'S TALE, WOMEN PLEASED, AND
LA FÉE URGELE: A STUDY IN THE TRANSFORMA-
TION OF FOLK-LORE THEMES IN DRAMA

Fletcher: 1579-1625.—*Woman Pleased*:—" *Women Pleased* was, in all likelihood, wholly composed by Fletcher. The date of its first production on the stage has not been discovered."¹

Favart, Charles Simon: 1710-1792.—*La Fée Urgele*:—"The title-page says: "Représentée devant Leurs Majestés, par les Comédiens Italiens ordinaires du Roi, à Fontainebleau, le 26 Octobre 1765. Et à Paris le 4 Décembre suivant."

The date of publishing of the copy used, as given at the foot of the title-page, was 1765.

¹ Dyce's edition, *Beaumont and Fletcher*, London, 1844: Vol. 7, p. 3.

If one were curious to know how Chaucer's *Wife of Bath's Tale* looks in dramatic dress, two excellent examples are afforded by Fletcher's *Women Pleased* and Favart's *La Fée Urgèle*. Though the differences between the two plays are what strike one most, there is at least one curious resemblance.

In Fletcher's play, Belvidere, the girl, is discovered in the embrace of Silvio, her lover. There is no question of a rape. Silvio is banished for a year, and a scroll is given him, in which a question is written: if he answers this question satisfactorily within the year, Belvidere shall be his wife; if he does not, he shall lose his head. We do not learn what the question is.

Belvidere, however, worms the answer to the question from her mother, flies the castle, and appears before Silvio, "disguised as a deformed old woman." She pretends to be a witch and says:

A thousand leagues I have cut through empty air,
Far swifter than the sailing rack that gallops
Upon the wings of angry winds, to seek thee.

Silvio, of course, does not recognize her and believes her to be endowed with extraordinary powers from heaven. Belvidere promises to be near when the time comes for him to answer the question and exacts from him a promise to grant what she will ask when her help has been given him.

At the moment of the trial, we have the following stage direction: "Enter Belvidere, disguised as before, who secretly gives Silvio a paper, and exit." It is not until this point (in Act 5, scene I) that we first discover what the question is (substantially the same as Chaucer's) and, at the same time, its answer.

Silvio having answered the question satisfactorily, Belvidere re-enters, still disguised. She claims the fulfillment of his promise, which is, to be her husband. Silvio at first objects strenuously, but finally acquiesces. Belvidere exit, but again re-enters, this time in her proper figure. She still holds off, however, propounding to Silvio the question, Will he have her fair and false or foul and true? Silvio replies: "Into thy sovereign will I put my answer." Belvidere rewards him by being just herself, which is all she had power to be anyway.

In *La Fée Urgèle* the stage direction standing at the very beginning of the play is: "Le Théâtre représente un Paysage des plus

agréables. On voit dans l'éloignement le Palais du Roi Dagobert." In other words, the setting, from the very beginning and throughout, is pastoral.

Enter Marton, a young girl, and her companion, Robinette. It appears that Marton has designs in the way of marriage on a certain Chevalier Robert, who is expected to pass that way. She meets him with a basket of flowers on her arm. He offers her "vingt écus" for the flowers and a kiss. He takes the kiss (here again there is no question of rape), but, his horse and baggage being stolen at that moment (he is a poor knight and carries his patrimony with him without difficulty), he is unable to pay the "vingt écus."

Marton determines to accuse Robert to *La Reine Berthe*. Robinette remonstrates: "Ah! le pauvre Robert! Vous allez l'accuser?" Marton replies: "C'est un moyen pour l'épouser." Robert is condemned to death by the court of Queen Bertha, unless he tells "ce qui séduit les femmes en tout tems."

He comes upon a number of *villageoises* dancing. They dance off the stage and leave in their place *une petite vieille ratatinée*. The old woman knows his trouble without being told. She receives from him his oath to grant what she will ask, and, promising to reveal the answer to his question as they go, sets out with him to the court of Queen Bertha.

The Chevalier answers the question to the satisfaction of the court, and the old woman demands him for her husband. He, of course, seeks to escape such a consequence, but to no avail.

Alone together in the old woman's tumble-down little house, Robert has difficulty schooling himself to receive her advances. He tells her that the image of Marton will not from him. His wife pretends to die of unrequited love, and Robert, stricken with remorse, beseeches her to live: he begs her to dispose of his lot, and he will abandon Marton. At this point, the scene breaks off, and the following stage direction introduces the new scene: "Le Théâtre change au bruit du Tonnerre, la Chaumière est transformée en un Palais magnifique, & la Fée Urgele paraît sur un Trône brillant, environnée de Nymphes de sa suite." In other words, la Fée Urgele appears in her own person, at the same time (as we learn a moment later) bearing a marked resemblance to

Marton, and the Knight realizes that his dearest wishes have been gratified. The *fée* says to Robert:

J'ai trop joui de ton erreur.

La Vieille était Marton, & Marton est Urgele.

The most striking resemblance between Fletcher and Favart and also perhaps the most striking difference of the two from Chaucer is found in the importance given to the girl whom the Knight meets at the very beginning of the story. Instead of appearing only at the beginning for a moment, as a sort of machine, merely, to start the story on its way, she becomes of central importance in the narrative; she is from the beginning, and remains throughout, the Knight's sweetheart, and far from being the persecuted recipient of his unwelcome attentions, she rather is the pursuer.

But the most valuable lesson to be drawn from the contrast of the two plays with each other and with Chaucer is that of what happens when a dramatist, going to a folk-lore theme for his plot, ignores the supernatural element in it. Fletcher's plot is irreparably inconsequent. Why, we may ask, does Belvidere come to her lover disguised when she knows he is wild to see her? Why should she make him promise to marry her when she knows he is wild to do that too? Why should she wait till the last minute before telling him the answer to the question and then write it? Why should she, in her own person, put the question fair and false or foul and true when she knows and he knows that she is just plain mortal and has no power to be either fairer or fouler or more or less faithful than as a matter of fact she is? The answer to these questions, of course, is that Belvidere was originally a super-human being. But Fletcher's audience does not know this, nor should it need to; being presented with a realistic drama, it has the right to demand of him realistic motivation of character.

Favart, on the other hand, has chosen the wiser part of frankly accepting the whole original story and giving it a setting congenial to its supernatural foundation.

GEORGE MCGILL VOGT.

Harvard University.

UNACKNOWLEDGED POEMS BY THOMAS CAMPBELL

Thomas Campbell was editor of the *New Monthly Magazine* from 1821 to 1830, and during these years contributed numerous poems to the publication. These bits of verse usually were signed with his name, but in a few instances this was not the case. His biographer William Beattie, in giving a list of the poems by Campbell in the magazine during 1821 and 1822, makes the specific statement that some other pieces by him appeared in these numbers of the periodical, but were not acknowledged.¹ Now, if we examine the volumes during these two years, we discover four poems signed *C*. If we continue our search, moreover, through the remaining years of Campbell's editorship, we find seven other poems appearing at intervals with the same signature. Now of these eleven poetic waifs, some have been claimed elsewhere for Campbell. Beattie admits that *Florine* (1830)² is by the poet and he adds that it was published with his name in an annual.³ Again, *The Farewell to Love* (1829),⁴ though not acknowledged originally, was included during Campbell's life time in the London edition of 1840, showing that the author was at last willing to claim it as his. Finally, the *Lines Written in Sickness* (1822),⁵ though not in this volume, is to be found in some other editions (e. g., Baltimore, 1833), a fact indicating that though the author did not approve of the work thoroughly, he must have signed his name to it somewhere, as for instance, in an annual. Now since three of these eleven pieces are surely by Campbell, it seems only natural that the other eight having the same signature *C* are likewise his. I shall characterize them briefly, indicating how far they resemble his acknowledged pieces and in what ways, if any, they are different.

¹ II, 412, of W. Beattie, *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, 3 vols., London, 1849. This book is the original authority for the poet's life since Beattie, who knew Campbell personally very well, received from him all the letters, notes, and other information to make the biography authoritative.

² The *New Monthly Magazine*, XXIX, 336.

³ Beattie, III, 70.

⁴ The *New Monthly Magazine*, XXVI, 490.

⁵ *Id.*, IV, 199.

A *Song* (1822)⁶ of thirty lines beginning *Must I drink a health to thee* describes the superiority of the poet's lady to the majority of his friends. It is typical of Campbell's love verse in running smoothly and being pretty, though conventional, and it is quite the equal of his usual amatory pieces. *The Fragment from My Pocket-Book* (1822),⁷ a work of ten lines, is the dedication to the poet's lady and to the moon of what was evidently going to be a long poem. It is printed on the same page of the magazine as the *Lines Written in Sickness*, and the two pieces are extremely alike in tone, though neither resembles Campbell's other productions much. The mood of both is more strongly romantic than is usual with him and somewhat resembles that of Keats, though of course we can not assume any influence. Presumably Campbell is trying his hand at a new type of verse, but the result is only moderately successful. Another *Song* (1822)⁸ of eight lines beginning *In my heart Love has built him a bower* is like Campbell's usual amatory verse in being musical and pretty. It has, moreover a note of humor in the fancy that Love is asleep in the poet's heart and must be awakened by having his nose tweaked by the lady. Thus it perhaps resembles *When Love came first to Earth* more than any other of his acknowledged poems. Again *A Foreign Soldier's Farewell to his English Mistress* (1823),⁹ a piece of sixteen lines, is characteristic of Campbell in combining sentiment with some degree of vigor, but the result is not remarkable as literature. A *Song* (1823)¹⁰ beginning *Oh how hard it is to find*, a poem of twelve lines lamenting the fate of lovers whose ladies are false to them, is not at all noteworthy in thought, but is fairly graceful in manner and has Campbell's usual note of sentiment. Another *Song* (1825)¹¹ of twelve lines beginning *Whither wilt thou roam—ah, whither*, is a lament for a faithless lover and is slightly better than the preceding poem. Its merits are of the same order,—that is, it is graceful and pretty in sentiment, but is lacking in real feeling. *A Family Group* (1827),¹² a poem of forty-six lines in heroic couplets, is a description of a stately old man and his wife with their lovely daughter all sitting in an

⁶ *Id.*, IV, 163.

⁷ *Id.*, IV, 199.

⁸ *Id.*, IV, 454.

⁹ *Id.*, VIII, 76.

¹⁰ *Id.*, VIII, 568.

¹¹ *Id.*, XIV, 379.

¹² *Id.*, XIX, 183.

elegantly decorated room. Though not at all noteworthy, the production is fairly creditable. It resembles parts of an acknowledged poem of the next year entitled *The Departure of Emigrants for New South Wales*, since both use the heroic couplet and both give detailed descriptions of every day life, though the people in *A Family Group* belong to a higher social class. Finally *The Course of the Prophecy* (1829)¹³ is an account in thirty-four lines of the predictions of Christ's coming. It is unlike anything of Campbell's, but in its use of blank verse and its general trend of thought suggests that he was attempting an imitation of Milton. In particular the influence of Milton seems clear in the lines:

it [the heavenly voice] was borne along
 From Lebanon to Carmel and throughout
 Sandy Judea to the purple shores
 Of Tyre (now ruin'd) by the silver sea.

Thus the poem shows that Campbell was at this time interested in a meter which he was to use two years afterward in one of the best of his later works, *The St. Leonard's Lines*. In this second poem, however, he abandoned Milton and chose a new poet as his master.

No one of these eight poems can be considered of striking merit, but many of them are fairly graceful and pretty, and several are quite as good as some of the acknowledged works. Six of the eight are similar in mood to others of Campbell's poems. The other two, *The Fragment from my Pocket-Book* and *The Course of the Prophecy*, are significant in that they indicate a reaching out for something new. The acknowledged poems during the 1820-1830 period often indicate a similar tendency, and thus we can clearly see that during these years Campbell was experimenting in handling types of poetry that he had not essayed before.

ALBERT MORTON BIERSTADT.

University of Wisconsin.

¹³ *Id.*, xxv, 80.

NOTES ON KING LEAR¹

King Lear—I, iv, 356.

A writer in *Modern Language Review* v (1910), 445-453, thinks (p. 449) that there is an inconsistency between "I have writ my sister" and "have you writ that letter to my sister?" (359), as Lear has "uttered" nothing to the purpose, that we know, except during this scene. There is no real difficulty when the passage is properly acted.

"What he hath uttered" means the last two lines of Lear's final speech (333-334). As Goneril says to her husband "Do you mark that," she moves to a desk or table and during the lines 338-355 writes a postscript to the letter which she has already dictated to Oswald to write (I, iii, 26 and I, iv, 359), this *postscript* containing a further warning based on Lear's final threat and also perhaps on the Fool's last fling which serves her as an example of the boldness and dangerousness of Lear's following. Regan perhaps required no prompting as to "the riotous knights that tend upon" her father (II, i, 96). But Goneril is making out her case, playing the game of parricide. As she says "if she sustain him &c," we may suppose that she folds her postscript and a moment later hands it to Oswald with instructions to supplement it verbally himself.

Who Was Burgundy?

I, i, 36, 47, &c.—Shakespeare first introduced a Lord of Burgundy into the Lear story. In the old play of *Leir*, Cordelia had been "solicited by divers peers," none of whom "her partial fancy hears." Shakespeare's Burgundy appears as a worldly, arrogant person, the foil to the chivalrous lover, France, who instructs him with polite scorn on the nature of love.

But why should Shakespeare have invented a Burgundy to stand thus in invidious contrast to the old enemy of England? In the chronicles Burgundy would appear as the traditional friend. The truth seems to be that Shakespeare intends not the Burgundy of Philip and Charles the Bold as a whole but the Imperial "Circle

¹References to "the Oxford Shakespeare."

of Burgundy" of the sixteenth century, embracing the Netherlands and Franche Comté, all which in 1605 had been for fifty years a possession of Spain. Holding these dominions, Philip II and Philip IV called themselves "Duke of Burgundy," successors to Charles the Bold.² The most characteristic part of the old duchy had been incorporated in France since 1477.

A recent editor of *King Lear* is puzzled to see any point in the distinction between "The milk of Burgundy and the vines of France" (l. 86), "as Burgundy was as famous for wine as France." But Moberly suggested long ago that by Burgundy Shakespeare means "southern Belgium," which was "part of Burgundy till the death of Charles the Bold." It was still, in a way, part of Philip's "Duchy of Burgundy" at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Not only in line 86 but later in line 261 Shakespeare points the contrast between the "waterish" Belgian pastures and French wines. Not the wine-growing Côte d'Or region, then, nor particularly the high, waterless country of Franche Comté is meant by Burgundy in this play, but Belgium.

Who then was "duke of Burgundy"? Practically the Spanish king. In the back of his head, at least, Shakespeare had him identified with Burgundy. Is it any wonder that such a person should be presented in a bad light? Spain had become the particular enemy of England, in comparison with whom France might be portrayed as amiable. That part of Spanish dominion which most closely concerned England was waterish Belgium, whose sufferings under tyrannous misrule are indicated in the Fifth Book of *The Faerie Queene*. Spain in Belgium was the national peril of Shakespeare's day. He might have been severer in his characterization of such a Burgundy, but like his Cordelia, is mild in word. With his audience, a Burgundian, *i. e.* a Spanish, marriage for a British princess was as unpopular as anything could be. France was much to be preferred, as King James later found out.

King Lear—IV, ii, 62-3.

Thou changèd and self-cover'd thing, etc.

These lines should be interpreted in connection with Albany's immediately preceding speech. It is difficult to suppose with some

² Philip III held Burgundy through his sister Isabella.

of the editors that at such a moment, when Albany is rising at last in dignity and fierce rebellion against his overbearing partner, he should devote a particular attention to her scowls. "Don't look so devilish" is the interpretation of Bradley, Verity, &c.

I would suggest:—"Changed from what I fondly saw in you, fiend still disguised in so fair a shape, for shame, make not your woman's form the house of a devil; such kenneling is an enormity, so unnatural as to be monstrous" (cf. I, i, 222-223, "That monsters it"). Albany had just exclaimed (59-61) that the devil was in this woman; in 62-63 he is remarking further on the monstrosity of such a phenomenon as the fiend's inhabiting the form of Goneril so fair in his eyes.

For "thing" as fiend see IV, vi, 68: "what thing was that?" and 73: "It was some fiend." For Goneril's beauty as hiding a devil or serpent cp. V, iii, 85, "This gilded serpent."

Albany has been and still is in love with his wife's stately, formidable beauty, "that pulse's magnificent come-and-go." The only way of understanding his distraction later in the closing scene after the death of Goneril is to consider that the poisoned love then surges up in him again. At this present juncture of revolt he wonders how the Goneril he had loved can be or harbor also this fiend. Bidding her not to be the monster of a devil in woman's form, he realizes that she is, and proceeds to say that *only* this woman's form, however "bemonstered" by its inhabitant within, keeps him from killing her.

King Lear—V, i, 33 ff.

When Koppel suggests that Edmund leave the stage only after "overtake you" in line 39, he considers that Edmund is then making not for Regan's headquarters but directly for Albany's tent. But when Edmund said (33), "I shall attend you presently at your tent," his meaning ought to be that he would first go to Regan's tent and then without delay to Albany's; the next line (34), spoken by Regan, naturally means that she is going with him and asks Goneril to accompany them.

I would, then, interpret thus:—Saying "I shall attend you presently at your tent," Edmund starts to go in the direction of Regan's tent, Regan turning to go with him and taking his arm.

Reflecting, however, that Goneril left with Albany may be present at the Council of War and perhaps gain a tactical advantage over her in winning some precious moments with Edmund, she halts, looks back sweetly over her shoulder, and invites her sister to go with them. Goneril, glowering at Regan's present point of vantage, snaps out a curt "no"; she does not propose to be made to play "gooseberry,"—rather stay with her husband! But partly in jealous anxiety, partly in malicious enjoyment, Regan persists: "'Tis most convenient," that is, plausibly suggests that during the Council of War about to meet, Goneril will have more of feminine privacy in Regan's quarters. Then it rushes over Goneril's mind not only that her sister is jealous, but that complying with her invitation she will have a chance on her own part of watching Regan and of poisoning her in her tent: such seems the meaning of "I know the riddle," spoken venomously, perhaps aside as Capell proposed. Accordingly, she moves off with Regan and Edmund, covering the latter with a conquering glance. At the same time Albany and his men move in another direction, towards his tent. But just then Edgar enters, and stopping to hear him Albany says to his followers that he will overtake them.

What Edmund does at Regan's quarters is suggested in lines 51 ff. He gets a paper, which he brings to Albany, showing the reports of his scouts. He has also perhaps had Goneril put her signature to a warrant for the execution of Lear and Cordelia: cf. l. 67, "they within our power, &c" and V, iii, 254. The time for these proceedings between 37 and 51 may seem a little short, but time is the most elastic thing in Shakespeare. Returning towards Albany's tent and overtaking him delayed by Edgar, the arch-villain delivers his paper and announces also that there is now no time for a council-of-war, apparently anxious not to have the subject of Lear and Cordelia discussed, and eager to be in the fight which may bring him a throne.

W. F. TAMBLYN.

*Western University,
London, Canada.*

THE MARE AND THE WOLF

"As the mare said to the wolf: 'The most learned are not the wisest men.'" Thus Chaucer's Miller (*CT.* A 4055). The fable implied here has of course long been identified; but inasmuch as it is really the result of a combination of two separate fables and the references one finds to its appearance in this or that collection overlook or obscure the distinctions, it is perhaps worth while to trace briefly the early history of the two motifs and their union.

The central motif, that of the kick, appears by itself in the fable of the Lion and the Horse. A Lion, claiming to be a doctor, approaches a horse; the horse however is suspicious, pretends to welcome him on account of a sore foot, and, when the Lion is examining the afflicted member, knocks him over. This occurs in the early Latin collection which goes under the name of Romulus and in most of its derivatives, *e. g.*, the eleventh-century Vienna Romulus, the so-called Romulus of Nilant (both the prose and the verse redactions), the Anonymus Neveleti often assigned to Gualterius Anglicus, the Novus Æsopus of Alexander Neckam (d. 1217), and others.¹ The same story, moreover, having a wolf for the Lion and an Ass for the Horse occurs in the Greek Aesop and its descendants.²

¹ Romulus, Book III, fable 2: Hervieux, *Les Fabulistes Latins*, 2nd edition, Paris, 1893, I, 307, 332, II, 214; Vienna Romulus, Hervieux I, 697, II, 435, 470; Romulus of Nilant, in prose, Hervieux, I, 709, II, 532, in verse, I, 802, 810, II, 682, 735; Gualt. Angl., Hervieux I, 496, II, 336, 360; Neckam, Hervieux I, 673, II, 405. See also Hervieux I, 776; II, 173, 256, 493, 583. For a Catalan version see *Histories d'altre Temps* IV, ed. R. Miquel y Planas, Barcelona, 1908, p. 106 f. The Ysopet versions are printed by A. C. M. Robert, *Fables Inédites*, I, 319 ff. Fuller bibliographical details, especially for later forms of the fables, and accounts of the interrelations of the various groups may be found in Robert's Introduction, in vol. I of J. Jacob's edition of Caxton's *Esope*, in Hervieux, and in H. L. D. Ward, *Catalogue of Romances*, II, 272 ff.

² Aesop, ed. Halm, no. 334; ed. Furia, Florence, 1809, no. 134 (cf. also the same fable in different words, Furia, no. 140); Aphthonias, no. 9 and Gabrias, no. 38 (in Nivelet, *Mythologia Æsopica*, London, 1682); *Roman de Renart* II. 7521 ff. (ed. Méon, Paris, 1826, p. 281 ff.). For further references see DuMéril, *Poésies Inédites du Moyen âge*, Paris, 1854, p. 195;

An entirely different fable, found in the *Disciplina Clericalis* of Petrus Alphonsi, tells of a Mule who when asked about his origin proudly declares himself 'one of God's creatures'; when pressed further, boasts of his grandfather (or uncle or mother); but refuses to admit his father was an Ass.³

Then these two fables are united, as in Jacques de Vitry (d. 1244) and Etienne de Bourbon (d. ca. 1261). A Fox asks a Mule what sort of animal he is. 'What is that to you?' replies the Mule; 'I am one of God's creatures.' The Fox asks again, and the Mule says he is a grandson of one of the King of Spain's steeds. 'But who were your father and your mother?' persists the Fox. Exasperated, the Mule answers, 'You will find my whole genealogy written on my hoof'; and kills him with a violent kick.⁴

The fable *De Vulpe et Mulo* seems to be an slightly elaborated version of this. A Fox comes upon a Mule feeding and says, 'Who are you?' The Mule replies, 'Bestia sum.' 'I didn't mean that. Who was your father?' 'I am descended from a horse,' says the Mule. 'Yes, but what is your name?' 'That I don't know,' answers the Mule; 'I was only a little fellow when my father died. But it is written on my left hind foot.' At this the Fox scents danger and retires to the woods; where he meets a Wolf, who was his enemy, lying in the shade nearly overcome with

Robert, *Fables Inédites* I, p. 319 ff. (La Fontaine, v, 8); and Guillon's edition of La Fontaine I, p. 279; and *Ysengrimus*, ed. E. Voigt, Halle, 1884, p. lxxxiii.

³ *Disciplina Clericalis*, ed. F. W. V. Schmidt, p. 42 (notes, p. 103); ed. Hilka-Söderhjelm, Helsingfors, 1911, I, Latin text, p. 9, II, French prose text, p. 7; French verse redaction, *Castoiment*, ed. Soc. des Bibliophiles Fr., Paris, 1824, p. 32 ff., II, 76 ff.; Juan Manuel, *El Libro de los Enxiemplos*, ed. Gayangos, Bibl. de Autores Españoles, LI, p. 478, no. 128. For later versions (including Abraham a Sancta Clara's *Judas der Ertzschelm*) see Schmidt's notes; Oesterley's notes in his edition of Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst*, Stuttgart, 1866, p. 493; and Robert, *Fables Inédites* II, p. 16 (La Fontaine, VI, 7). Guillon, in his edition of La Fontaine, cites also Plutarch, *Banquet of the Seven Sages* [150], but the resemblance is slight. Remote also is the fable of the Crocodile and the Wolf, Halm, no. 38, sometimes mentioned in this connection.

⁴ A. Lecoy de la Marche, *L'Esprit de nos Aïeux*, Paris [1888], p. 85; T. F. Crane, *Exempla of Jacques de Vitry*, London, 1890, pp. 13, 147. Professor Crane recognized that the fable is composed of two parts; I had finished the above note, however, before I saw his work.

hunger, and with taunts and exhortations persuades him to approach the Mule. The Wolf then asks the Mule the same questions, receives the same answers, unsuspectingly looks at the hoof, and gets his head broken.⁵

Practically the same story, but better told, appears in the *Cento Novelle Antiche* (compiled near the end of the thirteenth century), no. 94, with the moral—as in Chaucer—‘not all who can read are wise.’⁶ Since no other version has just this moral appended, one might suppose Chaucer was recalling this form of the fable. But the same story occurs in the Reynard poems with a similar though not so explicit tag and with a Mare in place of the Mule. This is quite decisive. Here Reynard and Isegrym meet a red mare with a black colt. At the bidding of Isegrym, who is very hungry, Reynard asks the mare if she will sell her daughter. ‘Certainly,’ says the Mare, ‘it is quite the fashion to do so.’ But when she tells him the price is written on her hind foot Reynard grows suspicious and calls the Wolf, flattering him on his knowledge of the languages.⁷

⁵ Hervieux, II, 272, from a fifteenth-century ms.; cf. I, 465; not in the usual Romulus, but no. 1 of the *Fabulae Extravagantes* (for a shorter version see Hervieux, I, 469, II, 304); Steinhöwel, *Äsop*, ed. Oesterley, Stuttgart, 1873, p. 192; Hans Sachs, ed. von Keller, Stuttgart, 1875, IX, p. 140 ff.; and in Catalan in *Histories d'altre Temps* VI, *Faules Isopiques*.

⁶ Ed. A. Mareduzzo, Milano, 1906, p. 95. This is sometimes referred to as no. 91 (as in the Borghini text). For additional references on this fable in oral tradition see D'Ancona, *Studj di Critica e Storia Letteraria*, Bologna, 1912, II, p. 140 f. Other similar versions are noted in Robert, *Fables Inédites* II, p. 365 (La Fontaine, XII, 17) and Guillon's edition of La Fontaine, II, p. 398. To which add Kirchhof's *Wendunmuth* IV, 138, an amusing version (ed. Oesterley, III, p. 128 f.; further references, VI, p. 113; and apparently also Luigi-Cinzio de' Fabrizzi, *Libro della Origine delle volgari Proverbi*, Venice, 1526, (N. v.); cf. *Jahrb. für rom. Lit.* I (1859), 311, 433.

⁷ Willem's *Reinaert* (ca. 1250), II, 3994 ff. (ed. Martin, Paderborn, 1874, p. 215 ff.); the prose *Hystorie* (printed 1479), ch. XX\II (ed. Muller en Logeman, Zwolle, 1892, p. 80 f.); Caxton, ch. XXVIII (ed. Arber, London, 1878, p. 62 f.; *Renart le Contrefait* (finished ca. 1342), ed. Raynaud et Lemaitre, Paris, 1914, II, p. 241 ff. This version was incorporated by Caxton in his *Esope* v, 10 (ed. J. Jacobs, I, p. 254, 255, II, p. 157, 179. Cf. also the Greek poem described by Gidel, *Etude sur la Littérature Grecque Moderne*, Paris, 1886, p. 331 ff. esp. p. 341 ff.

Thus the story seems to have grown. To the simple motif of the Horse or Ass outwitting the Lion or Wolf was added that of the boasting Mule and the Fox. Then the boasting motif was dropped and the Wolf reintroduced in order that the Fox might not be humiliated by a Mule (or Mare).

PAULL FRANKLIN BAUM.

Harvard University.

A SOURCE FOR GULLIVER'S FIRST VOYAGE

In *Modern Language Notes*, November, 1921, I noted several points of the influence of Lucian upon *Gulliver's Travels*, and more especially the influence of D'Ablancourt's sequel to Lucian's *True History*. From an entry in the *Journal to Stella* I was able to establish Swift's purchase of this French translation. Lucian's influence, however, was not confined to the *True History*. It is evident in at least two other satires, both of which are included in D'Ablancourt's translation.

One aspect of the satiric method in *Gulliver*, which hitherto has been regarded as original with Swift, is the satire of position which runs through the first two voyages, though it is carried through consistently only in the voyage to Lilliput. Briefly stated, the device is to reduce the scale of human life, and correspondingly to elevate the point of view, so as to render ridiculous all that is essentially petty. The machinery used is that of a giant among pygmies. This particular situation is original with Swift, though as I pointed out in the previous article the pygmy commonwealth was suggested by D'Ablancourt. The satiric idea, however, had been employed by Lucian in *Icaromenippus*, or *A Voyage to Heaven*. Menippus, describing his voyage to heaven, is asked by his friend to describe the appearance of the world from that altitude, and replies, in part, as follows:

"Fancy you see a small spot, not by so much as big as the moon, so that . . . one would wonder where were all those mighty mountains, those vast seas. . . . But more intently directing my eyes, I could discern all the transactions of human life, some sailing, some fighting, some plowing, some quarrelling. . . . To behold the actions of private persons is very odd and ridiculous . . . not to

mention others breaking their neighbors houses, lying with their wives, going to law, exacting usury; all which put together make a most ridiculous farce.

"Above all I could not but heartily laugh at those that contest the bounds of their countries, one taking pride in living in Licyon, another that he was master of a thousand acres in Acarnania. When all Greece appeared to me at that height not a span over, and Attica the least part of that too. I began to think what it was that men of estate value themselves upon, when he that had the most acres had no more than one of Epicurus' atoms. . . But the merriest of all was to see the wealthy men strut and look big with their rings, plate, etc., when the whole Pangaeum was no bigger than a millet-seed.

"(Friend) But the cities and the men in them, how do they appear?

"(Men) I suppose you have seen a nest of Pismires, some crowding together at home, some going abroad, others returning, others loading out ordure. . . I believe too, since they compose a small republic, they may have architects, physicians, magistrates, philosophers amongst them, and other necessary members of society. Just like these animals do great cities appear."¹

What Swift borrows here is after all just one idea, but it is an idea which motivates Gulliver's first voyage, and which does not appear elsewhere before the writing of *Gulliver's Travels*.

In Gulliver's visit to the land of the Struldbruggs, in the course of his third voyage, Swift reverses the sentiments of Cicero's *De Senectute*, and depicts the hideousness of old age, in language which is reminiscent of Lucian. In the satire entitled *On Mourning for the Dead*, a deceased son remonstrates with his father for his unreasonable grief:

"O wretched man, why dost thou create so much trouble for me? Forbear to pull off thy hair, and tear the skin from thy face. . . Dost thou think it a misfortune to me that I did not live to become such an old man as thyself, with a bald pate, a wrinkled face, stooping in the back, feeble knees, and almost wholly rotten with age, having lived many Olympiads and at length brought to dotage before so many witnesses?"²

¹ Vol. 1, pages 312 ff. All quotations are from the Dryden *Lucian* published in 1711. More than half of the translating was done by Tom Brown, with whom Swift was personally acquainted, and from whose works he borrowed hints for satire in *Gulliver*. For a complete statement of Swift's debt to Lucian and Tom Brown, the reader is referred to my book, "Gulliver's Travels,—A Critical Study," not yet published.

² Vol. 1, pages 187-8.

This passage bears the closest verbal resemblance to Swift, but the entire satire is an elaboration of the thought that old age is a curse.

The same thought is expressed by Terpsio in the sixth *Dialogue of the Dead*:

"In my opinion (oh Pluto) the oldest ought to die first, and the rest in their turn successively, without permitting an old gouty dotard to live, after he has lost the use of his senses, and is at best but an animated tomb. . . . The grievance would be somewhat alleviated, if one could but know how long they were to live, that one might avoid a tedious and fruitless courtship."³

These last passages seem to have served as suggestions for the episode of the Struldruggs, though they are by no means extensive sources. There can be no doubt that Swift knew his Lucian, though he drew upon the latter for occasional ideas, rather than for general method. The problem of the sources of *Gulliver* has been consistently ignored. In a future article I hope to throw some new light on the debt of Swift to Cyrano de Bergerac's *Histoire Comique des Etats et Empires du Soleil*.

WILLIAM A. EDDY.

Princeton University.

REVIEWS

Cleanness, an Alliterative Tripartite Poem on the Deluge, the Destruction of Sodom, and the Death of Belshazzar, by the Poet of Pearl. Edited by Sir Israel Gollancz. *Select Early English Poems* VII. Oxford University Press, 1921.

Professor Gollancz's edition of *Cleanness* (*Purity*) differs from my own¹ in several respects: the poem is printed in quatrains, many emendations are introduced in the text, and the notes are, in general, limited to explanation of these emendations and of difficult words and phrases. A second volume is to contain a glossary and illustrative texts.

In the Preface, which summarizes what is known concerning the plan, date, and sources of the poem, the editor makes the new suggestion that in several passages, especially lines 148 ff., 697-708, 1129-48, the poet was influenced by the *Book of the Knight of La*

³ Vol. III, pages 442-3.

¹ *Purity*, Yale Studies in English, LXI, New Haven, 1920.

Tour Landry, in the original French. This dependence, if proved, would be of importance in dating the poem, as the Knight tells us that he composed his treatise on etiquette in 1371. But the parallels are surely too slight to show that the author of *Purity* was familiar with the Knight's work. The point which Professor Gollancz considers most important is that which concerns line 148: 'Hopez pou I be a harlot pi erigaut to prayse.' This line, he thinks, can only be rightly interpreted in the light of the Knight's anecdote of the young squire who is rebuked for wearing a 'cote hardy' resembling a minstrel's. But it is not at all necessary to assume from the line in *Purity* that 'it is by no means a shabby garment that is referred to, but something ultra-fashionable, or such as to provoke antagonism, at all events a costume likely to win the praise of a low-minded person.' On the contrary, the context, with its references to 'no festival frok, bot fyled with werkkez' (136), 'wede so fowle' (140), 'so ratted a robe' (144), 'pat gown feble' (145), seem to me absolutely to forbid that the 'erigaut' be thought of here as 'something ultra-fashionable.' I take the line to mean nothing more than: 'Do you expect me to be base enough to praise your cloak?' i. e., 'How can I do otherwise than condemn it?' This is simply one of many lines in expansion of the story of the man without a wedding garment.

Professor Gollancz does not discuss in detail the vexed question of the relative chronology of the poems by the author of *The Pearl*, but that he still clings to Ten Brink's order may be inferred from his incidental remark that '*Patience*, from the artistic standpoint, could hardly have preceded *Cleanness*,' and from a few footnotes in refutation of my arguments for the priority of *Patience*. It is perhaps noteworthy that he does not here repeat the opinion expressed in his preface to *Patience* and elsewhere, that *Gawain* is the earliest of the four poems, an assumption that is extremely improbable.²

The division into quatrains, first suggested by Professor Gollancz in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* (I, 361), has

² See my edition of *Purity*, pp. xxxiii ff. It is interesting to find that in his new edition of *Pearl*, which came into my hands after this review was written, Gollancz definitely retracts his earlier view of the priority of *Gawain*, and is 'at present inclined to the view that a long period intervened between the homiletic poems and the matured excellence of *Gawain*' (p. xxxvi).

been definitely adopted in this edition, as it was in that of *Patience*, in the same series. That the poet frequently grouped his lines in fours is plain, not only from the marginal marks in the manuscript, but from the natural division of lines in *Purity* and *Patience*, as contrasted, for example, with that in *Gawain* or *The Wars of Alexander*. But whether this justifies one in printing the poems in quatrains is a disputable matter. The poet himself did not adhere carefully to this scheme, especially at the end of the poem, where the editor is obliged to assume stanzas of five lines in four cases (1541-5; 1586-90; 1757-61; 1762-6), and stanzas of two lines in two cases (1591-2; 1791-2), in order to retain the quatrain arrangement in other places.³ It is to Professor Gollancz's credit that he is courageous enough to attribute the confusion to the author, and not to the scribe. That the so-called 'stanzas' are not really units of thought may be easily seen from the editor's punctuation of lines 33 to 48, where commas occur at the end of the quatrains and heavier punctuation within them. Many of the editor's periods at the end of quatrains are factitious, since the lines might often just as easily be read as couplets or in groups of six, and the modern reader who finds the long homily in verse more attractive in this form must remember that the division is frequently one for the outward eye only. In some cases, it is true, the recognition of the tendency to quatrains has resulted in a better punctuation and interpretation of thought; for example, Gollancz's periods after lines 796 and 1020 are probably better than my commas. But, on the other hand, the editor's insistence on the quatrain arrangement has sometimes resulted in what seems to me a misinterpretation of the passage, at line 20, for example, where the period obscures the dependence of the 'nif'-clause on the *so* of line 17; or at least in an unnatural grouping of the lines, as at lines 388-9, where a semi-colon divides the two clauses beginning with *summe*.⁴

³ The scribe was not so clever as Professor Gollancz in discovering the precise points at which the poet lapsed from regularity; he continues to insert his marginal marks at 1569, 1573, 1581, 1589, where there can be no division, and again at 1761, 1765, 1769, 1773, 1777, 1781, etc., where perhaps his division is as likely as Professor Gollancz's.

⁴ For further discussion of this problem, see *Purity*, pp. xliii ff., where I have perhaps understated the importance of the grouping in four lines, and Emerson, *Modern Language Notes* xxxi, 2-4, on the grouping in *Patience*.

Only in a very few instances does Professor Gollancz read the manuscript differently from previous editors, and these are cases, for the most part, where the original reading has been blurred or altered. I think he is wrong in reading *forletez* instead of *forlotez* (101), *fyltyr* instead of *fylter* (224), *rysod* instead of *rysed* (1203), *loued* instead of *laued* (1703), *enfannined* instead of *enfaminied* (1194), though in the last case the appearance of two strokes instead of one (over the i's) may be due to the rotograph. *Žisse* (229) cannot be right; the manuscript may be read *pis* or *jis*, as the first letter is very indistinct, but there is no room for any other letters before *hit*. On the other hand, Gollancz may be right in seeing a *;* at the end of *stande* (1618), and in reading *halez*, not *houez* (458), where the manuscript is very much blotted.

The many important emendations are a welcome contribution to the interpretation of this most difficult text, and the most valuable part of Gollancz's edition, in spite of the fact that the manuscript has been too frequently tampered with without sufficient reason. Of the emendations proposed for the first time, some should be accepted at once: *feler* for *fele* (177); *skylnade* (ON. *skilnaðr*) for *skynalde* or *skyualde* (329), which solves the mystery of a much-discussed line; *sotyly* for *sothly* (654); *per* for *pe* (1766). Others range from ingenious changes which are very plausible to mechanical alteration for the sake of grammatical consistency or a smoother reading. Among the plausible emendations I should include *ferkez* for *ferre* (98), *seventepe* for *sevenpe* (427, translating the Vulgate *septimodecimo*), *bydene* for *by ene* (659), *gounes* for *gomes*⁵ (1315), *leue* for *loue* (1419), *þydras* for *pede* (1717). Among the unnecessary grammatical changes is *marred* for ms. *marre*, third plural (279), as a present tense (*byggynnez*) occurs in the next line. Even *myrle[d]* (475) and *walle[d]* (1390) are hazardous emendations, in view of the possibility that the Northern loss of the final dental is characteristic of the author's dialect.⁶ Still more hazardous are the many minor

⁵ Emerson (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology* xx, 234) suggests *genes* (for *gemmes*). Another of Emerson's suggestions, *bame* 'balm, comfort' (*ibid.*, p. 238) for *banne* (620) is proposed independently by Gollancz, whose form *baume* is perhaps preferable. This is undoubtedly the right word.

⁶ See Mabel Day, *Modern Language Review* xiv, 413, and Emerson, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* xx, 230.

changes made for the sake of avoiding awkwardness or increasing the smoothness of the line.⁷ What can possibly justify the omission of the second *he* in line 1423: 'For he waytez on wyde, his wenches he byholdes'? The metrical scheme of the second half-line is exactly the same as that in the line following—'aboutē bi þe wojes.'

Other emendations, due to fancied difficulties, are equally unnecessary. 'þe moste mountaynez on mor þenne watz no more dryȝe' (385), Gollancz alters to 'þe moste mountaynez on mor þenne [on] more dryȝe,' which he interprets 'the highest mountains on the moor then alone were more dry, i. e. less submerged than the rest,' the reason for the change being the fact that the next line declares '& þeron flokked þe folke.' But one may easily interpret the line as it stands to mean not that the mountains were completely covered, but simply that the waters of the flood were creeping upon even the highest of them; the floating comparative 'more dryȝe' of the emendation makes more difficulty than the manuscript reading.⁸

In attempting to restore the alliteration by means of emendation, Gollancz has made many needless changes and suggested others, because he failed to take into account the poet's use of double alliteration, especially of the type *a a b b*, a common characteristic of Middle English alliterative verse, and his practise of permitting an unstressed syllable to take the alliteration.⁹ In line 345: '“Now Noe,” quop oure lorde, “art þou al redy?”' Gollancz suggests *lede* for *al*, and similarly in line 1304: '& Nabugo de Nozar makes much joye,' he suggests *nouthe* for *much*; but the manuscript is justified in each case by the same form of alliteration (*a a b b*) in line 299: 'Sem soþly þat on, þat oþer hyȝt Cam,' and line 1573: 'out-taken bare two, & þenne he þe frydde.' In view of these cases, another tempting emendation *leue* to *beue*

⁷ Here I should include *vponande* for *vpon* (318); *þat* for *þer* (432); *wyȝh* for *þat* (594); *I* for *&* (917); *so* inserted after *for* (1057); *hatȝ* for *is* (1143); *hem* inserted after *spylt* (1220); *he* inserted after *hade* (1336); *þer* for *þat* (1532); *he* inserted before *cluchches*, 'bend' (1541); *his* for *þat* (1811).

⁸ The following changes are unnecessary for various reasons: *forþerde* for *forferde* (1051); *prystly* for *pryuyly* (1107); *plit strange* for *plit stronge*, 'great sin' (1494; see *NED.* for both meanings).

⁹ K. Schumacher, *Studien über den Stabreim in der me. Alliterationsdichtung* (Bonn, 1914), p. 27.

(1622) is unwise, since the alliteration may be: 'Baltazar vmbe-brayde hym, & "Leue sir," he sayde.' Line 745: 'þen Abraham obeched hym & loȝly him þonkkez,' suffers an extraordinary change at the editor's hands, becoming 'þen [þe burne] obeched hym & [b]oȝ[som]ly him þonkkez.' But even if 'obeched is obviously the alliterating word,' as Gollancz says, the alliteration may be on the unstressed *o*, not on the *b*, and by changing *loȝly* to *heȝly* (compare *Gawain* 773), surely a much less violent emendation, we have a line with regular vowel-alliteration.¹⁰

Since Professor Gollancz's own suggestions for the emendation of the text are so numerous and so important, it is singularly unfortunate that his editorial method does not permit him to give proper acknowledgment to the many scholars who have preceded him in endeavoring to interpret the difficulties of the text, and to distinguish between those emendations which have been proposed in print by others, and those appearing for the first time in his edition. Aside from some thirty obvious corrections of the manuscript which every editor or commentator has made mechanically, there are fifty-six emendations adopted in the present text which had been previously proposed by other students of the poem. Of these only nineteen are attributed to those who first proposed them in print, and though they may have occurred to the present editor independently, this hardly excuses his failure at least to mention the fact that he has been anticipated.¹¹

Similarly, even a desire to avoid controversy and condense as much as possible hardly excuses the careless and misleading way in which Professor Gollancz employs the phrase 'hitherto unexplained.' It is hardly fair, for example, to use the expression in connection with an interpretation of the difficult lines 433-4 which differs somewhat from *four* previously suggested (see my edition).

¹⁰ Vowels of course alliterate freely with *h* before vowels; cf. lines 11, 14.

¹¹ For example, Morris changed *stysteȝ þat myȝ* to *stynteȝ þaȝ nyȝt* (359); Bateson proposed *forþering* for *forering* (3), and *heryed* for *heyred* (1527); Emerson proposed *beckyr ande bol[l]e* (1474); *sanctorum* [þer] *sopfast* (1491). As my own edition came into Professor Gollancz's hands only after part of his was already in type, he can hardly be blamed for not mentioning the fact that I anticipated him in adopting *heven* for *her even* (50); *so wer* for *sower* (69); *murnande* (I read *mornande*) for *wepande* (778); *þer* for *þen* (926); *nomen* (Emerson, too, proposed *nomon*) for *no mon* (1002); *smelle* for *synne* (1019).

So, after Professor Emerson (and I, independently) had given an explanation of the word *ungoderly* (145), it is disconcerting to find what seems to me an extremely fantastic etymology proposed in this manner: 'This word, hitherto unexplained, seems an Englishing of "boner" (i. e. *bonaire*, a common ME. form for *deboner*, *debonaire*) = well-bred, with the negative prefix = "de mal aire," ill-mannered. The *-ly* suffix was due to analogy with "ungodly."' Finally, it should be noted that for *olipraunce* (1349) 'of hitherto unknown origin,' the editor elaborately presents an etymology (the French name *Olibrius*) proposed as long ago as 1890 by Henry Bradley (*Academy*, January 11).

The notes contain many ingenious and valuable explanations of obscure words and phrases, though the etymologies suggested are sometimes far-fetched. *Jumpred*,? 'confusion' (491) is more likely to be connected with Chaucer's verb *jumpre* (*Troilus* 2. 1037) than with *jumper*, 'bore with a jumper,' a technical meaning which has every appearance of being modern. 'For þat schewe me schale in þo schyre howsez' (553) is paraphrased 'Because it, i. e. a speck or spot, is shunned in those radiant mansions,' *schewe* being considered aphetic for *eschewe*, 'avoid.' But this is seeking trouble; *schewe* means 'appear' and taking *me* as 'one,' the line may be translated 'In order that one shall appear,' etc. Gollancz's defense of the manuscript *hokyllen* (1267, I emended to *he kyllen*), as 'hockle, cut down (like grass),' now seems to me right. 'Stepe stayred stones' (1396), usually translated 'brightly gleamed jewels,' cannot mean 'ascended the staired stones,' because 'step' is not used in this sense without a preposition. Gollancz's connection of *umbepour* (1384) with *umbethourid*, which occurs twice in *The Wars of Alexander* (3857, 4806) is probably correct, though the line is still obscure. I suggest the possibility of putting a comma after *þrowen*, and paraphrasing lines 1383-4 'Pinnacled towers at intervals, the length of twenty spears apart, and (even) more thickly crowded, surrounded by a paling set crosswise.' That *med* (1391) is related to OE. *gemet*, 'measure,' or *mode* (1635) to ON. *möt*, 'stamp,' or 'mark,' seems to me semantically improbable and phonologically impossible. In several instances Gollancz assumes that final *y* is the equivalent of *e*—*skyly* (62), *mayny-molde* (514); *clyvy* (1692), which he derives from OE. *clife*); but if this is true, it is possibly only a scribal error, as in

each case a *y* is found in the syllable preceding.¹² One of the most ingenious suggestions in the book is *þyðres* 'bowls, vessels,' Vulgate *hydria*, for the difficult *þede* (1717). Here, as elsewhere, Gollancz is careful to state precisely how the corruption of the text may have come about.

This review has naturally emphasized the points in which I dissent from Professor Gollancz, but I have not undertaken to discuss the differences, which are many, in the general plan and scope of his edition and my own. In spite of the fact that Professor Gollancz has solved, or at least brought us nearer the solution of, many cruces in *Purity*, fascinating problems of textual interpretation still remain. It is to be hoped that the appearance of two new editions of a poem long unduly neglected will direct attention not only to these problems, but to the importance of *Purity* in its relationship to the other poems of the alliterative school.

ROBERT J. MENNER.

Yale University.

Das dichterische Kunstwerk. Grundbegriffe der Urteilsbildung in der Literaturgeschichte von E. ERMATINGER. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner, 1921. viii + 405 pp.

What principles shall guide us in estimating the poet and his work? Such is the main question proposed in this book. As between two prevalent methods, the one historical, objective, and descriptive (tending to formalism), the other subjective and philosophical (tending to caprice), the author believes *in der Mitten liegt holdes Bescheiden*. While the critic should not be dominated by an ideal of abstract verity (unattainable anyway), he must have a sense of responsibility, appealing to his scientific and his social conscience.

The first distinction is between *Welt* and *Ich*. By *Welt* is meant not *Ding an sich* (excluded from the discussion as unknowable), but a sort of *Gesamtich*, a conventionalized ego, formed by tradi-

¹² But Emerson (*Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, xxxvii, 58 f.) cites many examples from this manuscript which seem to show that this representation of final unstressed *e* reflects confusion in the language itself.

tion. The varying conflict between these two forces is termed *Erleben*, and is the source of the poet's dynamic and vital idea, his *Weltanschauung*, which expresses itself in symbolic forms, his particular works. Thus at the outset naturalism and impressionism are condemned on principle, and the creative sovereignty of the poet is asserted.

The interplay of these forces (*Ich*, as feeling, sensation, will; and convention, as understanding, roughly speaking) results in *imagination*, which is a creator of new values. And the intensity of the conflict measures the creative power of any individual. Also the varying participation and energy of these elements in the struggle seem to the author to furnish fundamental distinctions between epic, lyric, and dramatic poets. He too readily finds agreement of certain examples with his theoretical views, and does not avoid the seductive fallacy of reasoning from a particular to a general. Mörike was indeed *passive* (though his writing poetry in bed does not prove it!), but Goethe, greatest of lyric poets, was not. And certainly the author should be more sceptical of his own reasoning than to commit himself to the assertion (p. 25), that, compared with epic poets, dramatists, because of the intenser conflict in them between *Ich* and *Welt*, *seldom grow old*. Virgil lived to be 51, Dante 56, Racine 60, Aeschylus 69 (and died by accident), Euripides 74, Corneille 78, Ibsen 78, Calderon 81, Grillparzer 81, Sophocles 90. In the same way Keller as calm, cool materialist, is made too exclusively the type of the epic poet. What about Dante? Dostoevsky? Accidental personal qualities are here confounded with the characteristics of *genre*.

More convincing is the discussion of the creative experience (*künstlerisches Erleben*). Philosophy is considered an aid to the poet in finding himself, striking examples being Keller, Kleist, and Hölderlin. Rejecting the milieu theory as impersonal and uncreative, the author affirms the unique and dynamic force of the creative spirit, and proceeds to set up the reach of experience, its intensity, and its degree of faith (as opposed to *Wissen*) as proper tests of genius. Goethe's reach, for example, is large, Storm's narrow. Schiller's dynamic ideas are limited chiefly to the conflict between realism and idealism, and no idea at all is manifest in his later works, from *Maria Stuart* on (p. 116), these plays being condemned as technical feats. (This view, for *Maria*

Stuart, at least, is contradicted by the author on p. 163). Absence of ideas characterizes journalistic and naturalistic writers, who employ a (spurious) principle of organization in certain scientific "truths" not born of their own experience.

The poet's dynamic idea symbolizes itself in material form, whence there must also be a *Stofferlebnis*. Here are considered the sources of material, and the relation of idea to material. Subjects may be invented, or else discovered (in present reality, in tradition, in the works of other poets). Invention is held to be least satisfactory, because the imagination of the individual must be poor compared with that of a people. This point of view leads the author to a pretty sweeping condemnation of modern drama since Hebbel. Of course the subject-matter is nothing in itself but only in relation to the creative mind of the poet. The subject is not "chosen" by the poet, but finds itself by a kind of pre-established harmony with the dynamic idea. In the finished work there is no subject (*Motiv*) distinguishable from idea, or vice versa. Indeed the very mental processes of the poet are symbolic, *sein Anschauen zugleich ein Denken, sein Denken ein Anschauen*. . . . *Nur der Dichter denkt symbolisch, im Stoff die Idee, mit der Idee den Stoff* (p. 57).

With most of this we can readily agree. The author then proceeds further to characterize epic, lyric, and dramatic poets by means of their *Stofferlebnis*. In the lyric experience everything is inward; there is no conflict, no real use of time and place, which here have only emotional values. In the dramatic material there must be implied a conflict adequate to the poet's ideal dualism, a demand which, needless to say, denies the static drama of naturalism. Epic material is more contemplative; in general it is incident rather than action, *schicksals-*, not *willensbestimmt*. Again the author is inclined to overstate his case. The *Nibelungen* material, for example, is both epic and dramatic, and Hebbel considered the author of the *Nibelungenlied* to be a "dramatist from head to foot." *Crime and Punishment* deals with the same basic problem as *Macbeth*. Nor is dramatic action always *willensbestimmt* (*Oedipus Rex*). It is too easy to attach abstract value to practical distinctions.

About half the book is concerned with *Formerlebnis*. Here the discussion turns on inner and outer form. Inner form seems

at bottom to be the same as *Gedankenerlebnis* (*Weltanschauung, Ideendynamik*). At any rate it is just this spiritual trend of the poet active in a particular work. It shows itself in three ways: as a peculiar atmosphere, as inner motivation, and as symbolic meaning. Under the first of these divisions are managed unobtrusively such difficult categories as comedy, tragedy, humor, the interesting section on tragedy resting firmly on Hegel. Inner motivation is unity of perspective, exemplified in detail by *Der Prinz von Homburg*. Particularly interesting is the explanation of rhythm in lyric poetry as a manifestation of this inner motivation. Perhaps the most important question asked in connection with inner form is, how we are to estimate the moral judgments approved by the poet in his work. In answer the author denies first the existence of any truth in an absolute sense in poetry (p. 270). But he definitely restricts this statement by taking refuge with Hegel's distinction between temporal moral conceptions and *Vernunft als sittliche Gesetzmässigkeit der Welt*. He finds that the history of literature confirms the philosopher, and that there are recognizable certain *letzte und allgemeinste Sittenbegriffe* common to all great poets. Some of these are specified: Sanctity of life, Truth, Love, Fidelity, Reverence (p. 272).

All the elements implicit in inner form affect the outer form, or style. The determining quality of outer form, compared with inner, is the "effect," or the consideration of the public. *Künstlerisch formen heisst letzten Endes die Gesichte des Innern in äussere Bildhaftigkeit wandeln, Unsichtbares sichtbar allen Blicken ausstellen* (p. 308). However carefully the author guards against any artificial conception of style, the sentence quoted illustrates the difficulty of making a clear distinction between inner and outer form, between *Gesichte des Innern* and *äussere Bildhaftigkeit*. In what sense can the most inner *vision* be *invisible*? The idea that the external situation (public) determines outer form is made the basis for distinguishing style in epic, lyric, and dramatic poetry. Here again some doubtful assertions are made. For example, the proposition that the lyric poet, more than the epic or the dramatic poet, strives for a clear, firm outer form (p. 314) is unprovable, if not meaningless. How valid also is the demand that the language of lyric poetry should avoid "jede Individualisierung durch bestimmte Beiwörter?" A few favorable examples are quoted to

show that lyric poetry *can* be written without such adjectives, and one poem of Arno Holz is held to prove the obverse. The poem, however, is bad for other reasons, and it would be very easy to cite good lyrics with *bestimmte Beiwörter*. Another overstatement of the truth is asserting that the language of lyric poetry is *Präsens und nur das Präsens*. It is generally, but not always: "Ich ging im Walde," "Es schlug mein Herz," "Ich sah des Sommers letzte Rose stehn."

In his characterization of epic style the author lays emphasis on the easygoing tempo, and the fullness of detail in the classical models, contrasted with the quicker movement of modern realism. His position is conservative. In the tendency to make the persons in the story represent themselves (as in drama) he sees the dissolution of epic form. True epic style is held to be a fine balance between *Bericht* and *Darstellung*. This section closes with an interesting discussion of language and rhythm in epic prose.

Style, or outer form, in the drama is determined by the fact that drama is intense conflict of opposing forces. "Static" drama is none. There must be action, and the action must be progressive, without a lapse. A concise and instructive comparison is given between the two types of action: *fortschreitende Handlung* and *rückgreifende Handlung*. A true explanation of the function of the latter, however, it seems to me is not advanced. The *rückgreifende Handlung* (as in *Ghosts*, for example) is employed in modern drama to solve the problem of combining character evolution with practicable unity of time and place, and it originated with Hebbel.¹ Needless to repeat, there is in the author's dramaturgy no room for the drama of naturalism, which he condemns for essentially the same reason as Bartels, Bytkowski, and others. The extent of his conservatism (or is it proper now to call it radicalism?) is seen in his defence of the monologue.

A refreshing feature of this treatise is its stout defense of the autonomy of literature. Psychology, not to mention psychiatry, is not considered the right key to the store-house of literary genius, while the classification of poets according to the subject matter, or even the philosophy of their works, is held to be extraneous to a true science of literature.

¹ Proof of this statement I hope to furnish elsewhere.

This book is derived by thorough scholarship from the best classical and realistic traditions of German literature. It will be helpful to the critic who reads it critically, and does not follow the author into such extremes as condemning poets he does not like by his system (Heine, and Hauptmann, works like *Der Ketzer von Soana* and *Der Narr in Christo* being implicitly at least classified as naturalistic). The reviewer regrets that space is lacking in which to point out its solid qualities more fully, and at the same time better to qualify his own occasional objections.

T. M. CAMPBELL.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College.

The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy with Special Reference to the Liturgic Drama. By NEIL C. BROOKS. [University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. VII, No. 2.] Urbana, 1921. 110 pp.

This study, as its title suggests, contains material of interest both to students of Christian archeology and to students of the liturgical plays. The author states, however, that it is an outgrowth of his own interest in the latter field and "is to be viewed primarily as an attempt to enlarge our knowledge of the *mise en scène* of the liturgical Easter plays" (p. 8). It thus supplements Professor Karl Young's discussion of *The Dramatic Associations of the Easter Sepulchre* (Madison, 1920) where there is no detailed consideration of the sepulchre itself, and investigates a subject much less exhaustively treated in Dr. J. K. Bonnell's article on *The Easter Sepulchrum in its Relation to the Architecture of the High Altar* (*PMLA*. xxxi, 1916, pp. 664 ff.).

Professor Brooks begins at the beginning—with such accounts of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem as have survived. He shows that the sixth and seventh century representations of the tomb of Christ in Syro-Palestinian art strikingly agree with the descriptions of early pilgrims and probably portray the Holy Sepulchre as it was in the time of Constantine, that is, a quadrangular structure completed by a sort of ciborium. In the medieval Byzantine representations, on the other hand, the tomb is variously portrayed

as hewn in a rock, as a sarcophagus before an opening into a rock, a sarcophagus surmounted by a ciborium, a sarcophagus alone, or a sort of square sentry-box.

In the West, although the influence of Byzantium made itself felt during the early middle ages, representations of the tomb in art developed independent types. During the late fourth and the fifth centuries the sepulchre is pictured as a cylindrical tower with cupola-shaped or conical roof. This simple tower-like type of structure is later replaced by a more elaborate sort of temple, an edifice of two or more stories, the lowest usually square in shape, the upper round. In the course of the eleventh century, however, the representation of the sepulchre as an edifice or as placed within an edifice begins to disappear, and the tomb is portrayed as a sarcophagus without architectural accessories. How far this Western coffer-tomb type developed as a result of Byzantine influence, Professor Brooks finds it difficult to say, but he thinks it possible (p. 25) that the religious drama may not have been without influence upon it.¹

At this point one naturally expects a discussion of the connection between the representations of the sepulchre in art and the Easter sepulchre used in the liturgical ceremonies. Instead the author pauses to consider (pp. 26-9) Dr. Bonnell's theory of the relations existing between the sepulchre in art and the high altar. He plausibly concludes that the Occidental representations of the tomb of Christ were not influenced by the architecture of the high altar and later (p. 85) he also rejects Dr. Bonnell's hypothesis that the Easter sepulchre of the liturgy "was reminiscent, if not directly an imitation, of the early form of canopied altar." Beyond a suggestion, however, that the coffer-shaped sepulchre recalls the sarcophagus used in Christian iconography from the eleventh century on (p. 62), Professor Brooks makes no attempt to connect the

¹ A fuller discussion of this point would have been welcome. Meyer's theory that the drama influenced representations of the Resurrection scene in art is mentioned, but Mâle's article in the *Revue de l'art ancien et moderne*, 1907 and his book, *L'Art religieux de la fin du moyen âge*, Paris 1908, which show the influence of the drama in the iconography of other scenes, are not cited. Following Meyer, Professor Brooks states (p. 13) that the actual moment of the Resurrection was not depicted before the latter part of the twelfth century. Mâle in *L'Art religieux du XIII^e s. en France* (3rd ed. 1910, p. 231) refers to an example of the eleventh century.

representation of the tomb of Christ in art with the Easter sepulchre, and in general avoids the question of "origins" altogether, unless his opinion that "the English Easter sepulchre developed very largely in imitation of the church burial of persons of rank" (p. 85) can be so interpreted. On the other hand, his classification and description of the various types of sepulchres used in continental and English churches,² his distinction between permanent and temporary sepulchres, his investigation of the location of the sepulchre in the different European countries in which it was employed, and his array of material from archival sources regarding its setting up, its contents, its lights, etc. add immeasurably to our knowledge of the *mise en scène* of the liturgical ceremonies.

These ceremonies are considered in detail in chapter V. Professor Brooks accepts the theory advanced by Professor Young that the extra-liturgical *Depositio Crucis* was influenced by the liturgical *Adoratio Crucis* of Good Friday. That, however, the reservation of the Host consecrated on Holy Thursday for the Missa Praesantificatorum of Good Friday also exerted some influence upon the rise of the *Depositio* seems to him less probable. He notes that there was little special pomp in early times connected with the reservation of the presanctified Host (pp. 33, 50), that texts indicating the burial of the Host alone on Good Friday are relatively uncommon before the sixteenth century (p. 40), and that the term "sepulchre" was never specifically given to the *repositor* in any place where the "true" sepulchre was set up on Friday, though it came into use in this connection after the disappearance of the true sepulchre (p. 50). He also shows that the Host, the symbol of the living Christ, was apparently considered more suitable for use in the *Elevatio* than in the *Depositio*, and he infers that in some cases where the Host was featured in the *Elevatio* but not in the corresponding *Depositio* it may have been placed in the sepulchre on Easter morning just before the *Elevatio*.

It is nevertheless true that the Host does appear in these ceremonies, that it appears alone and early, and that it appears very

² It is unfortunate that one must still consult Bonnell's summaries (pp. 667-81), based on the Easter plays alone, for an estimate of the relative frequency of the various types. An estimate based on the much more extensive data accessible to Professor Brooks would have been most useful.

frequently together with the Cross. How then account for its presence? Professor Brooks, while not accepting Professor Young's suggestion, offers none of his own. It would seem possible to me, however, to reconcile both the facts and our authorities by assuming that the *Depositio Crucis* arose in connection with the *Adoratio Crucis*, and that the use of the Host in place of the Cross or together with it is to be regarded as a somewhat later development, influenced where it occurs by the reservation of the presanctified Host.³

A classified list of the texts available for the study of the *Depositio* and *Elevatio* (pp. 33-6), a number of interesting conclusions based upon the grouping of these texts according to their provenience, a discussion of the meaning of the *Imago crucifixi* mentioned in some of them, an investigation of the liturgical positions of these ceremonies, a description of the Exposition rite still tolerated in Germany and Austria, an important distinction between the true sepulchre and the place of repose, and an Appendix containing a number of new or little known texts, these are only a few of the other valuable and suggestive contributions to the subject contained in this study. A special word of gratitude is due for the well-chosen illustrations that accompany it.

GRACE FRANK.

Baltimore.

French Conversation and Composition. By HARRY VINCENT WANN. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1920. 202 pp.

The aim of the work is, in the author's own words, to provide material for conversation and for grammatical review. Nothing new is offered in method, yet this is precisely what one should like to see in some of the many books coming yearly from the

³The absence of special pomp in connection with the reservation of the Host does not seem to me to preclude the probability that the act of placing the Corpus Domini in the *repositor* on Holy Thursday may have suggested to some the idea of burial which was essentially appropriate to Good Friday, especially in view of the fact that at all periods of liturgical history the receptacle for reserving the Eucharist was symbolized as a tomb (Young, p. 15). Indeed, the Host for the *Depositio* was sometimes consecrated at the same time as the Host for the Mass of Good Friday (Young, p. 17, note 34).

press in ever increasing numbers. As language is one of the means man has of reacting to living situations, of expressing his opinion concerning them, the chief aim of a book of this sort should be to recreate these situations, for they are largely absent in the conditions under which the teacher works. Grammar should be minimized. Ready-made questions are of little use, for they seem artificial to the teacher and are usually replaced by queries of his own. In view of these considerations the minor value of the present work is quite evident.

In addition to the questions on carefully selected texts and to the English-French sentence exercises, the author has introduced six exercises on equivalents, one "unfinished sentence exercise," four "definition exercises" and one "idées contraires" exercise. It is difficult to determine the aim which he proposes to reach by the use of the latter, or what is their place in the general plan of his book.

The vocabulary is entirely in French, a novel, and rather laudable feature, in view of the character and aim of the work. Most of the definitions, as the author avows in the preface, are taken from *Le Petit Larousse* and *Hatzfeld et Darmesteter*. Wherever Mr. Wann takes the definition bodily, he does well, but here and there he endeavors to abridge it, with resultant inaccuracies. Thus, for instance, p. 196, "tableau" is defined as "ouvrage de peinture exécuté sur toile." *Le Petit Larousse* has the same definition, but adds "sur toile, bois, etc." Mr. Wann's definition will prove misleading for the average student. P. 17, "Il chanta la Marseillaise (literary)." I presume that if the French of the Midi were told this, they would exclaim in M. Jourdain's fashion that they have been talking literary French all their lives, and haven't known it. P. 149, "Détail—Action de diviser en morceaux circonstance." This definition is inaccurate, since, when we speak of detail, we think of the result rather than of the process or action that brings it about. P. 152, One definition of *écume* is "bave de certains animaux échauffés ou en colère." Since *bave* is not defined anywhere in the vocabulary and since the word is rather unusual for beginners, the definition is useless. P. 196, "Sumac—sorte de plante." The definition would do for any plant. P. 198, "Traduction—Interprétation." The two words are not equivalent in meaning. P. 199, "Trille—Terme de Musique: manière de chanter une note."

But what kind of "manière de chanter"? The answer to this question would furnish the definition of the word. P. 200, "Vasistas—Petite partie mobile d'une porte ou d'une fenêtre." Again the definition says nothing. *Le Petit Larousse* gives the same, but the picture opposite it makes the definition clear.

If Mr. Wann's work proves of value and a second edition is contemplated, a revision of the vocabulary would seem most urgent. Surely an English-French vocabulary, totally missing now, would prove valuable to the student in the English-French translations and would make the work, for certain purposes, more usable.

GEORGE GETCHEV.

Syracuse University.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE DANCE OF DEATH IN SHAKESPEARE

In *The Dance of Death* of Francis Douce the following statement is made: "From a manuscript note by John Stowe in his copy of Leland's *Itinerary*, it appears that there was a Dance of Death in the church of Stratford upon Avon: and the conjecture that Shakespeare in a passage in *Measure for Measure* might have remembered it, will not, perhaps, be deemed very extravagant. He there alludes to Death and the fool, a subject always introduced into the paintings in question."¹ This is misleading, for it was not the collegiate church of the Holy Trinity to which Stow's note had reference, but the affiliated chapel of the Trinity, belonging to the Guild of the Holy Cross. Moreover, Shakespeare could scarcely have remembered the paintings under discussion since they had ceased to exist a century before his birth.

The passage from Leland, with Stow's note, reads: "There is a right goodly chappell in a faire strete toward the southe ende of the towne dedicate to the Trinitie. This chapell was newly reedified in mind of man by one Hughe Clopton, Major of London. About the body of this chaple was curiously paynted the Daunce of Deathe commonly called the Daunce of Powles, because the same was sometyme there paynted abowte the cloysters on the northwest syd of Powles church, pulled downe by the Duke of Somarset, tempore E. 6."²

¹ Douce: *The Dance of Death exhibited in elegant engravings on wood* . . . p. 53.

² Leland: *Itinerary*, ed. by L. T. Smith, vol. II, Part v, p. 49. About—E. 6. is Stow's note.

In 1804 Thomas Fisher made accurate reproductions of paintings and frescoes on the walls of the chapel of the Trinity,³ just brought to light after years of whitewash and oblivion. Fisher records paintings in the nave and chancel, but not one which is suggestive of the Dance of Death. Stow's note undoubtedly refers to paintings ante-dating those which Fisher preserves; destroyed at the time Sir Hugh Clopton "reedified" the chapel; and therefore preceding Shakespeare by over one hundred years.

Such was the popularity of the macabre epic, however, even in the Elizabethan period, that it is not at all improbable that Shakespeare was familiar with the Dance of Death and that this familiarity can be seen in his work.

The passage from *Measure for Measure* reads:

Merely, thou art Death's fool;
For him thou labour'st by thy flight to shun
And yet runn'st toward him still.⁴

The following passage from *Richard II* is quoted in the introduction to Smith's edition of Holbein's *Dance of Death*. It would seem to recall the cut of "Death and the Emperor."

for within the hollow crown
That rounds the mortal temples of a king
Keeps Death his court, and there the antic sits,
Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp,
Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
To monarchize, be fear'd, and kill with looks,
Infusing him with self and vain conceit,
As if this flesh which walls about our life
Were brass impregnable; and humour'd thus
Comes at the last and with a little pin
Bores through his castle wall, and—farewell king!⁵

These quotations are merely suggestive of the Dance. Far more clearly its influence is felt in the opening of the first scene of the fifth act of *Hamlet*. Here we find not only a list, after the manner of the Dance, but the very structure is reminiscent, Hamlet playing the part of the "Auctor" who points the melancholy moral to the "Lector," Horatio.

We have first the Politician. "It might be the pate of a politician, which this ass now o'erreaches; one that would circumvent God, might it not?"

Then the Courtier: "Or of a courtier, which could say, 'Good morrow, sweet lord! How dost thou, good lord?' This might be

³ Fisher: *Ancient, Allegorical, Historical and Legendary Paintings in Fresco Discovered in the Summer of 1804 on the walls of the Chapel of the Trinity at Stratford upon Avon.*

⁴ *Measure for Measure*, III, ii

⁵ *Richard II*, III, ii. Quoted in Smith: *Holbein's Dance of Death*, p. 39.

my lord such-a-one, that prais'd my lord such-a-one's horse, when he meant to beg it and now my Lady Worm's; chapless and knock'd about the mazzard with a sexton's spade. Here's fine revolution, if we had the trick to see't."

With the mention of the Lawyer and the Rich Man the tone becomes unmistakably macabre. "Why might not that be the skull of a lawyer? Where be his quiddits now, his quillets, his cases, his tenures, and his tricks? Why does he suffer this rude knave now to knock him about the sconce with a dirty shovel, and will not tell him of his action of battery? Hum! This fellow might be in's time a great buyer of land, with his statutes, his recognizances, his fines, his double vouchers, his recoveries. Is this the fine of his fines, and the recovery of his recoveries, to have his fine pate full of fine dirt? Will his vouchers vouch him no more of his purchases, and double ones too, than the length and breadth of a pair of indentures? The very conveyances of his lands will hardly lie in this box, and must the inheritor himself have no more, ha?"

Ophelia and Yorick complete the list, Ophelia corresponding to the Gentlewoman of the old Dance, and Yorick to the Fool. As the "inheritor" was mentioned in Hamlet's remarks on the buyer of land, so the "lady" appears in his lament for Yorick. "Here hung those lips that I have kiss'd I know not how oft. Where be your gibes now, your gambols, your songs, your flashes of merriment, that were wont to set the table on a roar? Not one now, to mock your own grinning? Quite chop-fallen? Now get you to my lady's chamber, and tell her, let her paint an inch thick, to this favour she must come. Make her laugh at that."

To sum up, we have in scene i, act V of *Hamlet* the following stock characters of the Dance of Death: the Auctor, the Lector, the Gentlewoman, the Politician, the Courtier, the Lawyer, the Rich Man, the Heir, the Lady, and the Fool.

MARGARET MILNE BECK.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Julius Caesar II, i, 10-34

The soliloquy of Brutus at the beginning of the second act of *Julius Caesar*, in which Caesar is compared to a serpent still in the egg, may be a further indication that Shakespeare is following some sixteenth century Latin play, now lost. The phrase "Et tu, Brute," in the following act, not found in any of the historical accounts of the assassination, has often been thought to suggest such an origin. Professor Ayres has, further, shown that Shakespeare's conception of the character of Caesar is not that of the historians, but rather that of the sixteenth century writers of tragedies on this then popular theme.

The soliloquy of Brutus referred to has seemed rather flat to most critics. Coleridge, for example, calls it singular; Hudson speaks of Brutus' "giddiness of the head"; Hodge calls it a "sophistic device." But it must be noted that the soliloquy would in Latin have much more point, from a play on the word *regulus*, appearing in Shakespeare's play as "adder."

The meaning of the words "brings forth the adder" is, of course, "hatches the adder from its shell"; this is proved by the last lines of the passage:

And therefore, think him as a serpent's egg
Which, hatch'd, would, as his kind, grow mischievous,
And kill him in the shell.

Adder is the common translation for the Latin *regulus*, the crowned serpent, often called basilisk or cockatrice. In the Vulgate, *Proverbs* 23, 32 appears thus: *Mordebit ut coluber, et sicut regulus venena diffundet*. The King James version here translates *regulus* as *adder*, with the marginal gloss: "Or a cockatrice."¹

The stories of the birth of the cockatrice or *regulus* from the egg of a cock, and of the deadly power of its mere glance, are familiar enough; it, if any serpent, would "crave wary walking." Lemnius in his *De occultis Miraculis Naturæ* (ed. 1598), Bk. iv, ch. 12, gives this account: "Ubi vero decrepitis [gallus] esse incipit, ac senectute confici, quod nonnullis septimo, nono, aut ad summum decimo-quarto euenit, pro virium vel robore vel imbecillitate, aut etiam concumbendi assuetudine, qua nulli non animantium naturæ vis deiicitur atque enervatur, ouum profert æstiu mensibus, ac Caniculæ sideris exortu, ex putrefacto, opinor, seminis excremento, aut humorum colluie conflatum, forma non oblonga, vel ouali, vt gallinis assolet, sed rotunda atque orbiculata, colore modo luteo, buxæ, flauescenti, versicolore, lurido, ex quo produci basiliscum, Latine regulum, nonnulli opinantur, venenatam bestiam, sesquipedali magnitudine, triplici frontis apice, tanquam regio diademate insignitam, erecto infestoque corpore, atque oculis vibrantibus, quibus obuios halitus contagione conficit." In this passage the *æstiu mensibus* corresponds to Shakespeare's "bright day," and *produci* to his "brings forth."

The whole point of the soliloquy, however, is to be found in the double meaning of the word *regulus*, and this point is lost altogether in translating it "adder"; in its original meaning, as a diminutive of *rex*, it would be the natural, somewhat contemptuous term for Brutus to use of Caesar as a would-be king, an unhatched kinglet. This play on the two meanings of *regulus* is quite in keeping with the character of Brutus as he is portrayed in the tragedy, and is of a sort to appeal to any sixteenth century

¹ I do not mean that the English word *adder* always meant *basilisk*; but only that *adder* was the common translation of *regulus* or *basiliscus*.

writer of Latin plays; it would furnish excuse enough for the whole passage. That Shakespeare noted it and kept it in mind is confirmed by the reference in *Hamlet* (a play in which many passages have a striking similarity to passages in *Julius Caesar*, probably its immediate predecessor) to King Claudius as a crowned serpent:

The serpent that did sting thy father's life
Now wears his crown.

Here, as in *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare is evidently thinking of the *regulus* with its poisonous qualities as a suitable comparison for a king newly and wrongfully come to power. It is very noteworthy that he was also still thinking of Latin plays on the subject of Julius Caesar, as produced at the universities; this is shown by Polonius' remark:

"I did enact Julius Caesar. I was kill'd i' the Capitol;
Brutus killed me."

The basis of Brutus' whole soliloquy is thus a play on the word *regulus*. As Shakespeare in paraphrasing it in English could not find any word combining the two meanings of *regulus*, the whole passage loses most of its point and thus seems rather flat.

JOHN D. REA.

Indiana University.

"LOOKING UNDER THE SUN"

Professor C. Alphonso Smith's extremely interesting discussion (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxvii, 120 f.) of the phrase *under the sonne he loketh* found in Chaucer's *Knichtes Tale* 839 and in certain modern ballads puts one in mind of an early instance of a very similar expression. In the Old English poem of *The Phoenix* we are told that the wondrous bird, who is waiting for the sun to rise at the edge of the water,—

under lyft ofer lagu lōcað georne . . . (line 101).

A literal, though of course very awkward, rendering of this line would be: 'he looks in the direction of (the space) under the sky (and) over the water.' For the meaning of *lyft*, see, e. g., *Elene* 1270 f.: *feoh āghwām bið / lāne under lyfte*; cp. *under heofenum*, *roderum*, *swegle*, *wolcnum*, *tunglum*, *sunnan*. If the phoenix had been watching for some object in broad daylight, the poet might well have said *under sunnan* (accusative) instead of *under lyft lōcað*.

The construction is thoroughly in accord with Germanic syntactical conceptions. Suffice it to mention *Heliand* 655 f: *than sāhun sie sō wislīko undar thana wolknes skion / up te them hōhen*

himile, hwō fōrun thea hwiton sterron, and, as a suggestive counterpart, *Elene* 87 ff.: *ūp lōcade . . . geseah hē . . . wuldres trēo ofer wolcna hrōf / golde ge[g]lenged*.

As to the expression *under sunnan*, its occurrence in the *Metres of Boethius* 14. 7 may be noted: *ðēah þēs middangeard ond þis manna cyn / sȳ under sunnan* (dative) *sūð, west, ond ēast / his anwalde eall underðieded*.

FR. KLAEBER.

The University of Minnesota.

"UNDER THE SONNE"

Professor C. Alphonso Smith offers a tempting explanation (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXVII, 120-1) of a passage in Chaucer's *Knight's Tale*, A, 1696-8:

whan this duc was come unto the launde
Under the sonne he looketh, and anon
He was war of Arcite and Palamon.

He believes that "under the sun" means "all around, turning from one point of the compass to the other," and in support quotes from several modern American versions of certain ballads. But it is very doubtful if the phrases in Chaucer and the second ballad are connected in history or meaning. The points of the compass, and the "all," which make the meaning clear in the ballad, are lacking in the Chaucerian passage. "All under the sun," being clearer than "under the sun," should be the earlier and not the later form. "Under the sun" and like phrases are common in Anglo-Saxon and especially in the Bible ("sub sole" occurs dozens of times in *Ecclesiastes*), and mean simply "on earth." This does not fit the *Knight's Tale* passage, so we may do well to consider another interpretation, not a poetic but a literal and perhaps colloquial one, which will show why the phrase apparently does not occur before Chaucer. As Theseus came out of the dark wood into the sunny glade, he peered in the direction of the early-morning sun, shading his eyes with his hand perhaps, a picturesque figure which has always seemed to some readers what Chaucer meant to sketch. This explanation seems quite as well as Dr. Smith's to fit the first ballad passage which he quotes.

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK.

Stanford University.

A PORTMANTEAU WORD OF 1761: "TOMAX"

In the sixth chapter of *Through the Looking-Glass*, Alice meets Humpty Dumpty, and asks him to explain the meaning of the poem called "Jabberwocky." Everyone remembers the "hard

words" elucidated: *brillig*, four o'clock in the afternoon, "the time when you begin *broiling* things for dinner; *slithy*, which means 'lithe and slimy.' 'Lithe' is the same as 'active.' You see [said Humpty Dumpty] it's like a portmanteau—there are two meanings packed up into one word."

If Lewis Carroll was the inventor of the term, he was not the inventor of the thing. My colleague, Professor Paul R. Lieder, has called my attention to a portmanteau word dating from 1761. In that year was published at Boston a collection of gratulatory verses presented by the President and Fellows of Harvard College to the new King, George III; this volume is entitled: "*Pietas et Gratulatio Collegii Cantabrigiensis apud Novanglos. Bostoni-Massachusettensium. Typis J. Green & J. Russell. MDCCLXI.*" It includes verses in Greek, Latin, and English, written by various Harvard worthies, but no signatures were affixed to the contributions; the introduction itself bears simply the phrase

We are, with all humility,
May it please your MAJESTY,
Your MAJESTY's most loyal
And most dutiful Subjects,
The President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Two copies of this volume are to be found in the Harvard Library, and one copy is in the Boston Public Library. Both of the Harvard copies were acquired after the fire which destroyed the library in Harvard Hall in 1764, and neither is the first imprint of the first edition. Professor Lieder owns a copy (without the list of *errata* printed in the Harvard copies) which he found in a bookshop on Cape Cod; it contains readings later amended.

In one of the Harvard copies, the title-page of which is inscribed "Samuel Eliot 1761," may be found a note from Professor Norton, dated 31 January, 1879, to Justin Winsor, Librarian of the University, 1877-1897. It reads:

Dear Mr. Winsor:

I have little doubt that the name of the person who gave the '*Pietas et Gratulatio*' to S. Eliot was Lowell,—not Sewell [*sic*].

Mr. Eliot and the Lowells, father and son, were friends for many years.

Very truly yours,

C. E. NORTON.

The pamphlet was bound with others, the gift of Samuel A. Eliot in 1845; the second copy came to the Harvard Library in 1853.

There was no member of the Harvard Class of 1761 named Eliot, so the date after his name is evidently that of his acquisition of the book. His copy is filled with ms. notes of interest, only one of which need detain us here.

The eleventh contribution (beginning on page 31 of the pamphlet, and extending to page 41, inclusive) is written in the iambic pentameter couplet characteristic of the eighteenth century. The fulsome compliments to the sovereign we may pass over, pausing at one verse (on page 35) which reads

Here he restrain'd the Indian's thirst of gore,
And bid the murd'rous tomax drink no more;

Among the MS. notes of Mr. Eliot is a footnote on this page 35 to "tomax." The word is, he observes, "compounded of Tomahawk and ax." It is a portmanteau word, which must have been as clear to the average reader in the England of 1761—as clear to George III himself—as *brillig* or *slithy* would have been to us, had not Humpty Dumpty kindly explained them.

ROBERT WITHINGTON.

Smith College.

HENRY MORE'S *Psychozoia*

Miss Marjorie H. Nicolson, in her article on Henry More's *Psychozoia* in the March issue of *Modern Language Notes*, states that this poem was first published in 1648. After the first publication of his "Platonick Song of the Soul," of which *Psychozoia* forms the first part, More revised and enlarged his book. He 'licked' the poems, as he fondly thought, "into some more tolerable form and smoothnesse," and published the result under the general title, *Philosophicall Poems*. This is the book to which Miss Nicolson refers in her statement above mentioned; but this was the second edition of *Psychozoia*, and it was published in 1647, not 1648. The first edition was published under the general title, *Psychozoia Platonica: or a Platonick Song of the Soul*, in 1642.

ROBERT SHAFER.

Wells College.

BRIEF MENTION

Language: its Nature, Development, and Origin. By Otto Jespersen (London, George Allen & Unwin, 1922. 448 pp.). Many a thoughtful reader will probably be surprised at the order in which the divisions of the subject are arranged in the sub-title of this treatise, because his sense of logical sequence would require 'Origin' to be placed first. To discover that Dr. Jespersen has in this been strictly logical is to discover the most distinctive feature of his linguistic speculation, for which one turns at once to page 418. That important page is preceded by paragraphs in which the *a priori* methods of reasoning about the origin of speech

(resulting in the *bow-wow*, the *poooh-poooh*, the *ding-dong* and other theories) are shown to be inadequate. These theories have been based on the untenable assumption of "a speechless mankind" and have yielded the most meagre results. What may be conjectured concerning the origin of language must, however, be disclosed by reversing the direction of the investigator's path. He must not move forward from the assumed speechless man, but backward from the developed into the most undeveloped state of linguistic phenomena, and from what is thus verifiable he must infer the still less and ultimately the least developed state of primitive expression. The basis of this method of reasoning must be the investigation of "(1) the language of children; (2) the language of primitive races; and (3) the history of languages." The discussion of these topics must, therefore, logically precede the discussion of the last topic, "the origin of speech."

The author's description and defense of the adopted method, stated to be employed now for the first time "consistently," may here be quoted in part. It is "to trace our modern twentieth-century languages as far back in time as history and our materials will allow us; and then, from this comparison of present English with Old English, of Danish with Old Norse, and of both with 'Common Gothonic,' of French and Italian with Latin, of modern Indian dialects with Sanskrit, etc., to deduce definite laws for the development of languages in general, and to try and [read to] find a system of lines which can be lengthened backwards beyond the reach of history. If we should succeed in discovering certain qualities to be generally typical of the earlier as opposed to the later stages of languages, we shall be justified in concluding that the same qualities obtained in a still higher degree in the earliest times of all." If, by this projection into prehistoric conditions, into the childhood of mankind, "we arrive finally at uttered sounds of such a description that they can no longer be called a real language, but something antecedent to language—why, then the problem will have been solved; for transformation is something we can understand, while a creation out of nothing can never be comprehended by human understanding."

The method described is, therefore, not to solve in its ultimate form the question of the origin of language, but it is to lead to inferences of characteristics of the first semblances of 'real language.' What inferences does Dr. Jespersen offer for consideration?

As to speech-sounds, it is argued backward from the clarifying and simplifying effects of 'advancing civilization' that primitive languages must have been rich in difficult not neatly articulated sounds, making long, unanalyzed words, which were uttered with little restraint of passion and therefore with excessive ranges of pitch, as in song. On the side of grammar, there was entanglement and unanalyzed complications. "Primitive linguistic units," to

take the next step in the investigation, "must have been much more complicated in point of meaning, as well as much longer in point of sound, than those with which we are most familiar"; there was great lack of distinction between word and sentence. And irregularities or anomalies, from the cultivated point of view, as in the series *bonus*, *melior*, *optimus*, typify the psychology and the unsystematic habit of the primitive mind, which was lexical rather than grammatically logical. These inferences are then confirmed by the evidence of the languages of savage tribes, and the summarized result is emphasized: "The evolution of language shows a progressive tendency from inseparable, irregular conglomerations to freely and regularly combinable short elements" (p. 429). The vocabulary of simple tribes is enormously increased because of separately naming instead of classifying concrete and related objects, and because of containing no words for the expression of abstract ideas. Now, this concreteness, it is held, establishes "a close relationship between primitive words and poetry." The primitive man "was forced to express his thoughts in the language of poetry," in metaphor or by allegory: poetry precedes prose. The author is especially emphatic in opposing the judgment of Madvig and Whitney, who assumed the communication of thought to be the primary impulse of language. On the contrary, "the genesis of language is . . . in the poetic side of life"; in craving for expression, emotions and instincts preceded thought. Love made a primary demand for expression, and love-songs belong to the effective instrumentalities "in bringing about human language" (p. 484). A foot-note at this point reminds the reader that this view of primitive love-songs is reproduced from the author's *Progress in Language*, 1894, (a book that is now out of print and is now superseded by the present volume), and that the criticism it has elicited is refuted by a just consideration of his inductively obtained basis for reasoning backward toward the earliest impulses and forms of expression.

The subject is continued by taking a wider view of "Primitive Singing" (p. 434 f.) to embrace all the emotional occasions of song, which, in varying measure, is inarticulate in primitive, and in savage, and in peasant-life. The inference is that "men sang out their feelings long before they were able to speak their thoughts. . . . Our remote ancestors had not the slightest notion that such a thing as communicating ideas and feelings to someone else was possible. They little suspected that in singing as nature prompted them they were paving the way for a language capable of rendering minute shades of thought." The next question discussed is thus stated: "How did that which originally was a jingle of meaningless sounds come to be an instrument of thought?" And how was 'the sentence' evolved? The conclusion of the whole matter is this: "Language, then, began with half-musical

unanalyzed expressions for individual beings [concrete words, specialized in meaning, notably proper names; see p. 438] and solitary events. Languages composed of, and evolved from, such words and quasi-sentences are clumsy and insufficient instruments of thought, being intricate, capricious and difficult. But from the beginning the tendency has been one of progress, slow and fitful progress, but still progress towards greater and greater clearness, regularity, ease and pliancy." Of course, no language has yet attained perfection.

Dr. Jespersen has, of course, not definitely determined the beginnings of language, but he has reasoned about the subject in a keen and masterful manner, and the inferences he has drawn from linguistic data put the question—which can never be completely solved—on a fruitful basis for further speculation.

This treatise consists of "Book I, History of Linguistic Science"; "Book II, The Child"; "Book III, The Individual and the World"; "Book IV, Development of Language." Of the last 'Book' (pp. 305-442), the chapter on the origin of speech occupies less than one-fourth of the pages (pp. 412-442); but in extenuation of the charge of having given in this notice a disproportionate account of this chapter it is to be kept in mind that the author wishes all the preceding parts of his treatise to be directly and indirect preparation for his final argument. In these precedents (making twenty-four chapters), there are many paragraphs that do not relate directly to any purpose more specific than the advocacy of sound linguistic reasoning, which is carefully distinguished from philological reasoning in its comprehensive reaches. Accordingly a diversity of topics is handled in Dr. Jespersen's original and suggestive manner, with only an occasional touch of severity in criticism, which is always palliated by his unrelenting seriousness. The characteristics of his manner are well-shown in the chapter on "Etymology" (pp. 305-318), which may be mentioned because of the value of some new details, and especially for the emphasis on the fact that this subject has become severely scientific, leaving no encouragement to mere guess-work. But even the scientific method may mislead one into the error of an over-confident acceptance of a result. Thus, in Dr. Jespersen's opinion, Hermann Möller in a "model article," meeting "all the legitimate requirements of a scientific etymology," has solved "the riddle of *G. ganz*" (p. 308).

The second 'book' of the treatise, on the language of the child and its influence on linguistic development, tho abounding in suggestiveness also shows that the author's enthusiasm may at times beguile him into diffusiveness and an excessive citation of evidence of very slight significance, if indeed it be at all pertinent. The discussion could with advantage be considerably condensed. But the general reader will probably find this 'book' especially enter-

taining. He will surely mark the statement that "the two sexes differ very greatly in regard to speech" (p. 146); that in speech-facility little girls surpass the boys; and that this difference persists in adult-life. Dr. Jespersen has overlooked the evidence of the craniologist at this point. Recent investigations are reported to show that the sexes differ in the development of the convolution of Broca. However that may be, there are many sides to this question, and some of these are interestingly discussed in chapter XIII of the next 'book.'

Dr. Jespersen enters upon a critical examination of exaggerated and loosely accepted traditions relating to a difference in language between women and men belonging to the same tribe or linguistic community,—a difference which in its most reduced form has psychological and cultural aspects. "There can be no doubt that women exercise a great and universal influence on linguistic development through their instinctive shrinking from coarse and gross expressions" (p. 246). A feminine revolt against Gongorism and Marinism resulted in the artificiality of *Les Précieuses*. Another generalization is this: "the vocabulary of a woman as a rule is much less extensive than that of a man," for she keeps in "the main road of language, whereas man is inclined to find out new paths" (p. 248). Altho "linguistically quicker than man" she is slow to see the point of a pun.

A marked feature of woman's language is the use of verbs of intensity. Lord Chesterfield heard a "fine woman" declare a small gold snuff-box "to be *vastly* pretty, because it was so *vastly* little." The snuff-box is out of date, but the woman of to-day is *just crazy* about many another object, for that is *so* like her. The literary artist has not overlooked the feminine "stop short or pull up" sentence: 'Well, I never'; 'The trouble you must have taken,' etc. Moreover, in sentence-structure, women are paratactic, men are hypotactic. "In a Danish comedy a young girl" is interrupted in her recital by the exclamation of her brother ("who has slyly taken out his watch"), "I declare! you have said *and then* fifteen times in less than two and a half minutes." In the final sentence of this chapter it is conjectured that the "great social changes" now affecting the world "may eventually modify even the linguistic relations of the two sexes."

A wide range of discerning observations will be recognized in the chapter on "Pidgin and Congeners," but this must now be dismissed from further notice, and commended, together with various other divisions, for the linguistic acumen and instructiveness always characteristic of what is offered by Dr. Jespersen. It may be said, however, that his efficient linguistic reasoning is at times too exclusive of cultural, philological implications; and his marked originality may lead him to put a captious emphasis on unimportant distinctions, as when he pronounces the theory of *nasalis*

sonans "a disfiguring excrescence on linguistic science" (p. 317; cf. p. 92). It is also not irrelevant at this point to notice that Dr. Jespersen advocates the manufacture and use of an artificial, international language, and pronounces a favorable judgment on the product Ido (pp. 9, 99; on p. 22 an obligation to Leibnitz is acknowledged).

No scholar can profitably ignore the history of his science. That is true in a very special sense when that history is chiefly in the present-perfect tense, when so much of what is significant in it relates to the present as the basis for further progress. There is not much in the history of the science of language as understood to-day that the scholar may safely pronounce negligible; it is for the most part too recent and plainly suggestive of the next steps to be taken. A sketch of that history is accordingly supplied in Dr. Jespersen's first 'book' (pp. 19-99),—a difficult task well performed.

The first division of this sketch, "Before 1800," supplies suggestive glances at "antiquity," the "Middle Ages and Renaissance," and "Eighteenth-century Speculation" with specific evaluation of Herder as linguistic philosopher and a recall to deserved notice of Jenisch. The latter's analysis of the essentials of language, which results in a formula for comparing and ranking languages is noteworthy. It is declared deeper and more comprehensive than Grimm's "attempt at estimating language" (p. 60), and was the begetter, one may assume, of Dr. Jespersen's contribution to *Scientia*, 1914, "Energetik der Sprache" and of his persistent maintenance of the "energetic views of language" (p. 9).

The science of language being in so specific a sense an attainment of the nineteenth century, a linguistic survey of that period constitutes the chief portion of this 'book' (pp. 32-99). It is brought down from Rask and Grimm to the year 1880, the date of the first edition of Delbrück's *Einleitung* and of Paul's *Prinzipien*, and closed with a brief indication of subsequent "general tendencies." This history, as is well known and here duly acknowledged, has been composed by other scholars. (Attention may be directed to the recent sketch forming the Introduction to Paul's *Deutsche Grammatik*). To these the student will turn with a freshly aroused interest after observing the significantly eclectic chapters in which Dr. Jespersen has so admirably executed his intention "to throw into relief the great lines of development rather than to give many details." His primary purpose in this has been, he declares, to supply "an introduction to the problems dealt with in the rest of the book," in which is therefore demonstrated the vital continuity in the history of linguistic investigation and theory.

J. W. B.